

CHAPTER 4

Doing Whiteness and Masculinities at School

Finnish 12- to 15-Year-Olds' Narratives on Multiethnicity

Marja Peltola

Tampere University

Ann Phoenix

University College London

Abstract

As Finland becomes increasingly multiethnic, there is a growing need to understand how young, white Finnish people position themselves and others in relation to norms of Finnishness and whiteness, and in relation to racism and (in)equalities. In popular narratives, assumptions of increasing “tolerance” and decreasing racism and inequalities are sometimes particularly attributed to young people, a perspective that enables most of the population to continue to evade issues of racism and perpetuate “white innocence” (Wekker 2016) and the color blindness (Bonilla-Silva 2003) of imagined Finnishness. In this

How to cite this book chapter:

Peltola, M. and A. Phoenix. 2022. “Doing Whiteness and Masculinities at School: Finnish 12- to 15-Year-Olds’ Narratives on Multiethnicity.” In *Finnishness, Whiteness and Coloniality*, edited by J. Hoegaerts, T. Liimatainen, L. Hekanaho and E. Peterson, 101–27. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-17-5>.

chapter, we draw on a study of masculinities in 12- to 15-year-olds in Helsinki to examine these issues by focusing on the white Finnish participants' narratives on multiethnicity. Our theoretical starting point is to understand the intersections of Finnishness, whiteness, and masculinities. We argue that while the interviewees widely embraced egalitarianism and multicultural ideologies in the interviews, the norm of whiteness was unquestioned and the contradictions characteristic of white innocence largely prevailed. The combination of white Finnishness, male gender and egalitarian ideas allowed the white Finnish boys to occupy an unquestioned position of "ordinary boys." They were able to construct themselves as tolerant and to see multiethnicity and racism as phenomena that were largely irrelevant to them, while benefiting from a privileged white position.

Keywords: white innocence, Finnishness, multiethnicity, racism, masculinities, young people

Introduction

The myth of (historical) monoculturalism has long had a strong influence on how Finnishness is understood in Finland: as white and as never having included ethnicities other than Finnish. Yet, Finland has always been multicultural (e.g. Tervonen 2014) and as Suvi Keskinen (2019) points out, Finns were generally excluded from whiteness until the first half of the 20th century, being considered East Baltic, rather than white Nordic. Keskinen's analysis is important in demonstrating that racialization is not fixed and that it has changed for Finns in parallel ways to how Jewish people, Italians and Irish people "became white" in the United States (Roediger and Capotorto 2003). Equally, it highlights the relationality of racialization in that it is in comparison with other groups that Finns have become white and come to see themselves as always having been white. The pervasive belief in historically white monoculturalism can be understood as part of the multifaceted concept Gloria Wekker (2016) calls "white innocence." This concept describes the contradiction between denial of racism and evasion of issues of race on the one hand, and racialized hostility to migrants and minoritized ethnic groups on the other. In the Finnish case, commitment to what can be viewed as assimilationist ideologies requiring migrants to adapt to Finnishness (Nortio, Renvik and Jasinskaja-Lahti 2020) constitutes an example of white innocence. This can be viewed as part of the Finnish "cultural archive" (Wekker 2016), in which understandings of national history and identity normalize and render invisible contemporary racialized and ethnicized inequalities.

In recent decades, the growing numbers and increased diversity of ethnicized and racialized minorities in Finland have produced an intensified need to rethink the borders of Finnishness. For example, the "refugee crisis" in 2015,

the period of some months when Finland received greater numbers of asylum seekers than accustomed, was experienced as shaking the taken-for-granted link between national identity and whiteness. This was seen as threatening by many segments of the society (Keskinen 2018). These developments have simultaneously buttressed notions that migration does not disrupt understanding of the Finnish nation as white and slowly given rise to more critical discussions and rethinking of national identity and Finnishness (Nortio et al. 2016). As part of the reimagining of the “new” more multicultural Finland, the younger generations are often accorded special status. One popular narrative assumes that Finnish children and young people (who are still implicitly assumed to be white) are “doing” multiculturalism. In other words, unlike older generations, they attend multicultural educational institutions and other contexts and, on the implicit assumption that familiarity breeds liking, are assumed, therefore, to be growing up “tolerant” and living multiethnicity as “normal.” In consequence, they are considered a generation who will disrupt racialized divides and make racism obsolete. In that context, some teachers are resistant to acknowledging ethnicized and racialized differences between children and praise those who profess color blindness (Kimanen 2018).

Color-blind approaches are part of white innocence and have long been common in the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries with longer-acknowledged multicultural histories than Finland (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Schofield 1986). Although much critiqued, there has been a resurgence of color-blind ideologies, including in the United States following Barack Obama’s presidency (Wise 2010). They are widely criticized for evading color, while actively refusing to engage with the power relations of racism and social inequalities (Gillborn 2019). It is thus a form of racism that obscures, while perpetuating, the normative positioning of whiteness and the existence of racial inequalities and racism. It normalizes a focus on minoritized ethnic groups and renders whiteness invisible (Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2011). In the Finnish case, the re-imagining of the nation as white, but multicultural, raises two issues. First, even in ethnically more diverse areas of Finland, such as metropolitan Helsinki where the study discussed below is located, there is urban and social segregation. In addition, familiarity does not in itself prevent racism (van Ausdale and Feagin 2001). Second, the assumptions that younger generations are more “tolerant” than older generations, and that racism is decreasing and equality increasing, raise the problems identified for color blindness.

As Finland becomes increasingly multiethnic, understanding how young white people position themselves and are positioned in relation to norms of whiteness, racism and (in)equalities is increasingly important. In this chapter, we examine these issues in the context of a study of masculinities in 12- to 15-year-olds in Helsinki, focusing on the white Finnish participants’ narratives on multiethnicity. Our theoretical starting point is to understand the intersections of Finnishness, whiteness and masculinity. We argue that while the interviewees widely embraced multicultural ideologies in the interviews,

the norm of whiteness was unquestioned in the school contexts where the interviews took place, and the contradictions characteristic of white innocence (Wekker 2016) largely prevailed. The combination of white Finnishness, male gender and egalitarian ideas allowed those participants who were both white Finnish and boys to occupy the unquestioned position of “ordinary boys,” who were able to construct themselves as tolerant and to see multiethnicity and racism as phenomena that were largely irrelevant to them, while benefiting from a privileged (white) positioning.

The chapter is divided into five parts. It first discusses the theoretical frame by focusing on masculinities and whiteness and then describes the study that informs the chapter. In the three empirical sections, we discuss how the boys constructed the norm of white Finnishness before considering how they accounted for racialized difference in their schools and, finally, the ways in which they distanced racism from themselves.

Theorizing Whiteness and Masculinities

The theorization of whiteness and masculinities have both proliferated over the last couple of decades, but both fields have long been objects of study. While whiteness is often not recognized as important in everyday life, some scholars have long recognized its importance. For example, the African American scholar W. E. B. Du Bois published an essay in 1910 examining and analyzing whiteness, white people’s reluctance to be scrutinized and how the relative invisibility of whiteness for white people helps to maintain white supremacy (Du Bois 1920 [1910]). In the 1980s and 1990s, a few scholars (e.g. Fine et al. 1997; Frye 1983; hooks 1992; Kovel 1984; McIntosh 1988; Morrison 1994) analyzed whiteness and produced landmark scholarship that has helped to inaugurate the field of whiteness studies. Ruth Frankenberg’s (1993) research on white women and whiteness showed the relationality of whiteness as racialized positioning.

My argument in this book is that race shapes white women’s lives. In the same way that both men’s and women’s lives are shaped by their gender, and that both heterosexual and lesbian women’s experiences in the world are marked by their sexuality, white people and people of color live racially structured lives. In other words, any system of differentiation shapes those on whom it bestows privilege as well as those it oppresses. White people are “raced”, just as men are “gendered”. And in a social context where white people have too often viewed themselves as nonracial or racially neutral, it is crucial to look at the “racialness” of white experience. (Frankenberg 1993: 1)

Her argument, that whiteness matters and that it is relational and racialized, has largely been accepted among scholars of racialization and racism.

Frankenberg's theorization of whiteness as structural advantage, standpoint and unmarked, unnamed cultural practices was expanded by Michelle Fine et al. (1997: ix) as "a system of power and privilege, as a group, an identity, a social movement, a defense, an invention." The ways in which whiteness studies have developed includes what Robin DiAngelo (2006) called "white fragility," the notion that making whiteness visible against white people's wishes is aggressive and that arguments that white people have unearned and unacknowledged privilege and are often racist is racist against white people. Despite such resistances, the theorization of whiteness has moved beyond mainly seeking to establish its relevance to what France Winddance Twine and Charles Gallagher (2008) call the "third wave" of whiteness studies. This, they suggest, examines "white inflections, the nuanced and locally specific ways in which whiteness as a form of power is defined, deployed, performed, policed and reinvented" (Twine and Gallagher 2008: 5). Studies that characterize this third wave focus on institutional and ideological practices that maintain white privilege, however much it is challenged, and show that, in order to remain dominant, discourses of whiteness are flexible and shift to adjust to challenges. The flexibility and relative invisibility of whiteness are central to its normalization (Luttrell 2020).

As with whiteness, theorization of masculinities has also burgeoned over the last 20 years as they have become a source of anxiety in many societies. In particular, concern has focused on boys' poor educational attainment in relation to girls, their disengagement from schoolwork and their propensity for violence (Janssen 2015; Arnesen, Lahelma and Öhrn 2008). For Finnish boys, threats of violence, physicality, materiality and gendered performances ("fear power") have all been found to be used strategically as resources, to gain respect and dominance in schools (Manninen, Huuki and Sunnari 2011). This is in line with the theory of "hegemonic masculinity," originally developed by Tim Carrigan, R. W. Connell and John Lee (1985), which has become ubiquitous, while also critiqued, in the field of masculinity studies. According to Connell, masculinities are hierarchically organized so that hegemonic masculinity—associated with toughness, power and authority, among other things—dominates both femininity and other forms of masculinities, and is thus normative and underpins social understandings of ideal masculinity and the desires of many men and boys (Connell 1995).

Yet, masculinities are changing in many societies, including Finland. There is, for example, a decrease in homophobia for some older young men (McCormack 2011), reduction for some groups in problematic drinking cultures in Finland (Törrönen and Roumeliotis 2014) and changes in power relations associated with hegemonic masculinities (Hearn 2015). Gender does not, however, provide a total explanation for such findings. Boys' educational attainment cannot, for example, entirely be related to gender, but varies by ethnicity, social class and nation (Gross, Gottsburgsen and Phoenix 2016). Masculinities themselves have repeatedly been shown to be racialized across the globe

(Mac an Ghaill and Haywood 2014; Phoenix 2008). Masculinities thus have to be viewed as multidimensional, that is, intersectional, rather than singular (Mellström 2014). It is, therefore, vital to attend to boys' imaginaries of masculinities and themselves as masculine in changing times. These imaginaries are important in themselves, but they are also consequential in that imaginaries impact on how children and young people are treated, how they see themselves (Layne 2016) and how they negotiate everyday social orders of who is respected, valued and denigrated as masculine (Tolonen 2018).

Both whiteness and masculinities have functioned hegemonically, asserting their authority without violence through domination and leadership that depends on consensus expressed, for example, through the media (Gramsci 2006 [1971]). Both are dynamic, changing over time and proliferating rather than being fixed, but refusing attempts to render visible the power relations they entail. Talking of the phenomenon of "laddism" in the United Kingdom, Chris Haywood et al. (2018: 3) suggest that it is a contemporary form of masculinity that serves to reclaim patriarchal values where feminism has gained influence: "One of the strategies to regain power has been to adopt a marginal position in which white heterosexual men draw upon their victim status in order to re-articulate their power and control." Both masculinities and whiteness can, therefore, involve the refusal to recognize gendered and racialized power relations. Recognition that dynamic strategies to maintain power are commonly used by white people led the white, feminist scholar Paula Rothenberg (2000) to call her memoir "Invisible Privilege," using her own autobiography to provide insights into the complex intersections of gender, racialization and social class.

Given this background, it is important and timely to investigate how young white people position themselves within discourses of whiteness and gender and to situate those understandings in the particular contexts within which they live. The concept of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1989) is important here in that it provides a means of recognizing that everybody is simultaneously positioned within multiple social categories, such as gender, social class, nationality and "race" (Collins 2019). So even when focusing particularly on one social category, such as whiteness, intersectionality is a heuristic, reminding us that we cannot understand the category in isolation from others (Phoenix and Pattynama 2006). In order to illuminate the complexity of the intersections of gendered, racialized and national particularities of white Finnish young masculinities, the analyses below take a performative view of both whiteness and masculinities. They consider the ways in which the young people's narratives "do" white Finnishness and masculinities and how these intersect in the Finnish context.

Research Context and the Data

The chapter draws on data from the project *Masculinities and Ethnicities in New Times* (Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies 2017–2018). The interview

data were gathered in 2017–2018 among sixth- to eighth-graders (12–15 years old) in three comprehensive schools in Helsinki, as well as one youth club.

The Finnish comprehensive school, with its task to guarantee a high-quality basic education to everybody, is one of the flagships of the Finnish welfare state and a source of national pride. The school institution has traditionally had an important role in maintaining the idea of cultural homogeneity through reproduction of national representations and subjectivities. Despite its universalist aims, it has also been found to reproduce the link between Finnishness and whiteness through constructing the “normal” student as white and Finnish (Juva and Holm 2017). Imagining schools as multicultural, tolerant and equal—which Juva and Holm found common among teachers and school staff—serves to blur the normative position of white Finnishness and makes it difficult to address issues related to racism and discrimination in school.

Compared with schools in many other countries, the socioeconomic and ethnic segregation of comprehensive schools is a recent concern in Finland, but one that is increasing in urban areas (Bernelius and Vaattovaara 2016). In Helsinki, where this study is located, segregation between schools has been found to be greater than segregation in the surrounding residential areas; in terms of ethnic segregation, the proportions of school students statistically defined as from minoritized ethnic groups (“with foreign backgrounds”) vary between almost zero to more than 50 percent. In the Finnish context, 50 percent is higher than the national average, since, nationally, the proportion of the population “with foreign backgrounds” (the proxy available for ethnicity in Finland) was about 8 percent in 2020 (OSF 2021). Everyday realities in schools thus differ, and segregation poses very real challenges for some urban schools. However, it is noteworthy that the public discussion tends to focus on certain schools constructed as “problematic,” based on their reputations and assumptions that their students’ backgrounds deviate from white, middle-class norms. Much less attention has been paid to how white Finnish middle-class practices and choices maintain and strengthen school segregation (Kosunen 2016). This, in turn, highlights their normative and thus “unproblematic” positioning.

Schools in different residential areas were recruited into the study in order to include students from different social classes and ethnic backgrounds. One school was located in a relatively wealthy (upper-)middle-class area, where the students were almost exclusively white Finns—pseudonymized as Nurmi School below. One school was in an area that was socioeconomically mixed and had approximately one-fifth of pupils recorded as from “foreign backgrounds” (Kukkula School). The third school was located in a socioeconomically more vulnerable area, and it had a more sizeable share of pupils from other backgrounds than white Finnish (Harju School). The youth club was also located in a relatively socioeconomically deprived area (City of Helsinki 2019). Ethical clearance was received from the University of Helsinki, the divisions for Education (schools) and Culture and Leisure (the youth club) of the City of Helsinki and the principals of each school.

Seven focus group interviews with between two and five participants (two mixed gender, five boys' groups) and 22 individual interviews were conducted with altogether 32 participants. A total of 28 of the interviewees were boys, of whom one was transgender. Four were girls. The majority of the participants—23—were white Finns. Three were mixed-parentage and six had what is referred to in Finland as “migrant backgrounds”; they had backgrounds in Eritrea, Estonia, Ireland, Italy, Korea, Nepal, Russia, Somalia and the United States, and all except two were born in Finland. In terms of ethnicity, white Finns constituted the vast majority in two of the three schools. The participants' ethnic/migratory backgrounds roughly correspond with the different ethnic mixes present in the three schools, which is reflected in the small proportion of participants from other ethnicities. In Harju School, only one white Finnish pupil participated in a focus group interview (and he opted out of an individual interview), which is why our analysis of the white Finnish interviewees' narratives focuses mostly on the Nurmi and Kukkula Schools, and the youth club. The interviewees' backgrounds are briefly presented in Table 4.1.

Since we wanted to get a picture of how students thought about and “did” masculinities, we talked to all the students in the classes we approached about the study and offered them the possibility of participating in it. No pre-selection was made by the teachers or the researchers and we included everybody who volunteered and returned the signed parental permission slips. Given that gender is a relational construct and masculinities are performed and understood in relation to boys and girls (Connell 1995), we designed the study to include girls in the sample, as had been done in a London study of boys and masculinities (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002). We had little success, however, in recruiting girls. A common experience in all three schools was that most girls in the classes did not consider a study on masculinities inviting or relevant to them.

Most of the interviews were done in the schools, but three of the 32 young people were interviewed at home or in a youth club. The schools' temporal and

Table 4.1: Age, gender and migration status by interview type.

Age	Focus groups	Individual interviews	Gender	Focus groups	Individual interviews	Back-ground	Focus groups	Individual interviews
12	11	7	Boy	23	21	White Finnish	20	13
13	8	7	Girl	3	1	Mixed heritage	3	3
14	4	6	Total	26	22	Migrant background	3	6
15	3	2				Total	26	22
Total	26	22						

spatial organization therefore set conditions for most of the interviews, limiting the time available (the interviews lasted between 30 and 90 minutes) and defining the use of space. For ethical reasons, we let the participants choose whether they wanted to participate in both an individual and a focus group discussion or in only one of these, in order to avoid putting them in situations that were difficult or would cause social sanctions afterwards; and also considered this in the interview situations.

All the interviews were conducted in Finnish by Marja Peltola and first professionally transcribed in Finnish and then translated into English¹ to enable joint analysis (since Ann Phoenix does not speak Finnish). The accounts and narratives in the data are understood as co-constructed by the interviewees and the interviewer and influenced by the interview context. Thus, the school context and the interviewer's position as a white, Finnish female academic have inevitably had consequences for the interactions. The boys, for instance, assumed that as a Finn the interviewer shared an understanding of what a comprehensive school is like and had some familiarity with such schools. The whiteness of the interviewer was not commented on by the interviewees—whiteness was seldom discussed by the interviewees, which highlights its normative position. However, whiteness and Finnishness were self-evidently shared features with the white Finnish interviewees.

All the participants were asked questions about “multiculturalism” and ethnicity. None objected to the questions or queried them. However, the participants sometimes appeared puzzled and hesitant in response. It appeared that many were unaccustomed to discussing such issues and had difficulties in finding the vocabulary to do so. Further, it is possible that the shared position of being Finns, and understanding Finnishness as detached from “multiculturalism,” was so self-evident for some that discussion of it felt irrelevant.

Multiethnicity in the Schools, the Norm of Whiteness and Egalitarian Ideologies

Especially for the interviewees in the almost exclusively white Nurmi School, multiethnicity was a distant theme. This is not surprising given that the pervasiveness of “color blindness” (which is part of what constitutes white innocence, Wekker 2016) frequently makes racialization invisible to white people. In addition, the pervasive myth that Finland is monoethnic (Tervonen 2014) was not challenged, particularly since there were very few children from minoritized ethnic groups in Nurmi School. As a result, the white Finnish young people encountered few young people or adults they recognized as being from ethnicities other than their own. They viewed multiethnicity as removed from their everyday lives and marked by visible differences such as wearing a hijab or identifiable practices such as going to different religious classes.

Marja: What about then, multiculturalism, is that a thing that is visible in any way at this school?

Sofia:² What do you mean?

Marja: Like, are there any pupils from different backgrounds and different ethn-...?

Elsa / Veeti: [speaking simultaneously] Well hardly any...

Sofia: Do you mean like religion?

Marja: Well religion or, if you think like, if there's people who have moved here from somewhere else or their parents have moved here or something like that.

Veeti: Well I don't really know anyone's origins. I know only that two people attend different religious classes and then, I... That's it.

Sofia: Well I know, I've seen in the school corridors for example a couple, only three or four people who wear that kind of veil. But no one probably says anything to them, hopefully or like that. So it's like everybody adjusts to this (school).

*(Nurmi school, focus group 2, two boys and two girls, aged 12–13, white Finnish background)*³

It is striking that the young people in the above focus group are not familiar with the notion of multiculturalism. Sofia first asks what Marja means and when Marja has explained, she works to make sense of it in terms of her everyday experiences and settles on religious difference, checking whether this is what Marja means. Her shift of focus to religion enables Veeti to explain that two people in his class have different religions, apparently different from Evangelic Lutheran, the majority religion in Finland. Sofia then explains that she has seen in the school corridors (i.e. not in her classes) three or four people who wear “that kind of veil.” Difference and different religion for her are embodied in visible dress and is clearly Muslim, even though she does not know what the veil is called. In this, Sofia's account fits with those of many white young people and teachers, who focus on niqabs and burqas as signifiers of Muslim religion and multicultural difference (Scott-Bauman et al. 2020). It is noteworthy that, while issues of discrimination, problems or inequities have not been raised in relation to multiculturalism or religious difference, Sofia immediately explains: “But no one probably says anything to them, hopefully or anything like that.” It appears that acknowledging that she has noticed this difference requires an immediate denial of discrimination. There is a co-location of noticing difference and discrimination that must be refused. Yet, Sofia's denial of discrimination is partial in that she uses the words “probably” and “hopefully,” accepting that she does not actually know

and that it is possible that this signifier of difference may well be marked as a reason for discriminating against the girls who wear “that kind of veil.” Sofia’s final statement in the above extract is ambiguous in that it is neither clear who the “everybody” who is doing the adjusting is, nor what the adjustments are. However, her marking of religious difference serves to underline the norm of white Finnishness by highlighting particular Muslim girls as embodying multicultural difference.

Sofia’s account is indicative of the pervasiveness of egalitarian ideologies among the young people in the sample. This is exemplified in an individual interview with Aleks, also from Nurmi School.

Marja: I was still thinking about—so about ethnic background amongst your friends so, does it matter at all that, what is someone’s skin color or where their parents are from or—?

Aleksi: Noo. To me the main thing is that you’re a cool person and then like, funny jokes and you get along. So that is, in a way to me for example makes no difference if someone for example, likes some ballet and I don’t, but as long as I get along with them otherwise.

Marja: Right, so all the other things don’t matter?

Aleksi: M-hm (nods).

(Nurmi school, individual interview, boy 13 years old, white Finnish background)⁴

In his response, Aleks encapsulates issues that constitute popular or hegemonic masculinity, being cool and funny, telling funny jokes and being able to get along with other boys. He underlines this individualistic approach to accepting people for what they are by suggesting that even if a boy liked ballet (something that is antithetical to being hegemonically masculine according to many boys’ accounts), it would not matter as long as he got along with them. It is particularly noticeable that he avoids mentioning skin color or parents’ backgrounds altogether and gets onto what is perhaps safer ground for him, masculine sociability. In doing so, he implicitly equates ballet and minoritized ethnic group status as comparable and as non-normative, even as he is asserting that they do not matter. His account subtly reconstructs whiteness and hegemonic masculinities as norms.

This individualistic approach to multiculturalism is also evident in another interview from Nurmi School with Kristian and Valtteri.

Marja: How about here in school, can you see multiculturalism ...?

Kristian: ...It isn’t necessarily that multicultural here.

Valtteri: Here there is quite a lot of, the same Finnish people, like all, I see a lot of those comments (in the internet) where people complain

that how many, immigrants there supposedly are here and everything really horrible, so I think, here after all there aren't a lot and I think they're not causing any harm even. And, like there aren't that many here either so, really there aren't a lot. (...)

Marja: How do you think like in general that, does it matter that what is the person's skin color or...

Kristian: No.

Valtteri: No, I don't think so.

Kristian: It depends on what is there inside, inside the head.

Valtteri: Yeah, I think so too, it doesn't matter at all, that, like I don't get how it could matter at all, to some.

*(Nurmi School, focus group 4, two boys, both 12 years old, white Finnish background)*⁵

Kristian's and Valtteri's responses seem straightforwardly an indication of belief in multicultural equality, strong opposition to, and puzzlement at, racist discrimination and a commitment to treating people as individuals ("What is inside the head is what matters"). However, as well as espousing equality, Valtteri's longest turn also shows a taking-for-granted of the status quo and that his commitment to equality is provisional in that he focuses on numbers and seems to suggest that complaints might be justified if there were a lot of migrants in Finland.

All the participants above are able to take a color-blind approach at the level of an "all different, all equal" rhetoric because they are all white and take for granted their Finnishness and belonging in Finnish society. They are, therefore, accepting of the fact that they and people like them are the ones who decide whether migrants or religious minorities are accepted as belonging in Finland. As a result, their accounts implicitly reproduce the racialized status quo and, as found in much work on whiteness, makes their undoubted commitment to egalitarian ideologies and eschewing of racism, contingent and limited (Leonardo 2009; Nayak 2007). The example below takes a different focus, in being concerned with tourism and cuisine. However, it also serves to reproduce the notion that whiteness is the norm and minoritized ethnic groups are outsiders to the Finnish state. It comes from the individual interview with Veeti, who was cited in the first extract above in his focus group discussion.

Marja: Is multiculturalism in general the kind of thing that's like familiar to you or have you ever thought about it?

Veeti: It is familiar because we travel so much, so of course when I am abroad I eat more multicultural food and, especially because my parents

don't like these tourist places at all, for example some touristy restaurant. (...)

Marja: Do you have any opinion about that that Finland is now becoming somewhat multicultural after all, is it a good or a bad thing?

Veeti: Well I think it's quite a good thing. I'm probably, quite excited about that for example that Taco Bell is coming, do you know the American chain, so that's coming to Finland now and... I like it that at least in food culture that this Finland is becoming multicultural. (...) But then if you start to use a lot of money, or like really, a lot of money for religions, for example I was thinking a bit about what was it again, the chapel?... (Marja: The mosque-project?) Yeah about that, I was a bit like, quite a lot of money will probably be spent on that. In the end it isn't probably that much, but it was immediately, the first thought that is that now so wise? Because there aren't that many probably here in the end. So you could maybe make it a bit smaller. But yeah.

(Nurmi School, individual interview, boy 13 years old, white Finnish background)⁶

Veeti's account provides an example on the intersection of (upper-)middle-class positioning and white Finnishness. He is well travelled outside Finland and enjoys experiencing multicultures, particularly through food. As Stuart Hall (1997: 181) suggests: "To be at the leading edge of modern capitalism is to eat fifteen different cuisines in any one week." Veeti considered multiculturalism positive in relation to his consumption as a tourist and a diner. However, while he eloquently praised multiculturalism in Finnish food culture, he opposed multiculturalism that demanded what he saw as too much public investment in Helsinki's ongoing mosque project and, indeed, did not know the word mosque despite his apparent cosmopolitanism.

Phil Cohen (1988) suggests that "multicultures" and "multiracisms" can co-exist. In the case of white young people interviewed about masculinities, white innocence (Wekker 2016) meant that they took a conditional approach to multiculturalism and, as Emma Nortio, Tuuli Anna Renvik and Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti (2020) found, did not consider that Finnish society should change to include migrants and people from minoritized ethnic groups. The section below moves from consideration of the young people's conceptualization of multiculturalism in general, to examining the ways in which they described their experiences of racialization in their schools and classrooms.

Accounting for Racialized Difference at School

In two of the schools, the students encountered other ethnicities on a daily basis. Therefore, they had the opportunity to become familiar with young people

from other ethnic groups and, potentially, to become friends. This section considers whether this was the case. It examines how white Finnish young people at these ethnically mixed schools thought about multiculturalism at their schools, as well as their views on the young people from different ethnicities they met at school. The popularized notions that prejudice is the result of prejudging (Allport 1954) or that familiarity breeds liking (Zajonc 1968) would suggest that being in the same classrooms would decrease racism and increase multicultural commitments. However, the literature available has long demonstrated that these notions are too simplistic (Rattansi 2020) and that power relations, local and national contexts and histories are all implicated in interactions in “contact zones,” which are frequently conflictual (Pratt 1991). This complexity was evident in the accounts of the young people in the study reported here.

Marja: Is this school in your opinion so-called multicultural, whatever you think that means?

Lauri: Yes. (others show their agreement)

Marja: How does that then show here?

Lauri: Well everybody gets along but it may, some people, particular people, maybe if (...) those who have come from somewhere abroad so they try to take a role, at least some.

Onni: Yeah, really a lot.

Marja: What sort of roles?

Onni: Well like they start to throw their weight around, terribly much. Probably just because they wouldn't be left as targets of such behavior, but in my opinion there's almost none of that at all here in my school. I don't say now that everybody's doing that but quite often when that comes from somewhere, generally it is from the immigrants. (...)

Marja: If you think about the teachers, does it show in any way in their behavior that people come from different backgrounds? Is it so-called equal here, the treatment?

Lauri: It depends a bit, it may be a bit stricter for the foreigners. But it may well depend on their own behavior.

(Kukkula School, focus group 5, five boys, 14–15 years old, four with white Finnish background, one with white Estonian background)⁷

In the above focus group, all the boys agreed that their school is multicultural and, when asked how that is evident in their school, Lauri explains that they all get along, but immediately makes exceptions by explaining that “particular people ... come from somewhere abroad so they try to take a role.” It is noteworthy that while he quickly explains what multicultural means, his engagement

with difference is less fluent in that he stops, restarts, talks about “some people,” “particular people,” then “at least some” when making a distinction between some of those who come from abroad and, implicitly, presumably white Finnish people. Unlike the clarity of his statement that multicultural means that everybody gets along, the rest of his first response is far from clear to the interviewer or reader, although it seems clear to Onni, who says “Yeah, really a lot.” When the interviewer asks for clarification, it is Onni who responds with a long turn, explaining that “they start to throw their weight around, terribly much.” Just as Lauri seems to have felt impelled to give an explanatory extension to his first statement, so Onni provides an explanation of his first answer that suggests that the people he is talking about might “throw their weight around.” His explanation suggests that this may be because “they” are targets for other people. However, having suggested this, which implicitly suggests that boys identified as “immigrants” may be badly treated by white Finnish people, he gives his opinion that this does not happen in his school and that, while not all “immigrants” are like this, when there are such problems, they are caused by “the immigrants.” The interviewer follows this up by asking about whether teachers treat everyone equally and it is Lauri who again gives a response explaining that “it may be a bit stricter for the foreigners,” but that this is probably contingent on “their own behavior.”

The effect of this exchange is to maintain white Finnishness as the norm and “immigrants” and “foreigners” as problematic by comparison. In these exchanges, both Lauri and Onni smooth over contradictions by recognizing that “other” young people may be treated badly while denying that it happens in their school or suggesting that it only occurs as a response to those young people’s unacceptable behavior.

While exchanges such as those above were common in the study, a different perspective was presented in an interview with a trans boy and his female friend, both of whom were white and Finnish. In their fast-flowing, co-constructed account, the social boundary between white Finnish boys and boys from minoritized ethnic groups is related to social class and racism.

Sami: We have a ridiculously white school, or I mean Finland in general is very white. So then especially the sports class, they are all white. (...)

Katriina: Then also, they’re also relatively wealthy, those in the sports class.

Sami: Yes, they’re all quite wealthy, they always have all the latest fashions, more new clothes and... good mobile phones and everything else like that. (...)

Katriina: Yes it’s a bit, then also when they’re—I don’t know if they are racist or not, when they... well it seems to be a bit like that they are (racist), at least a bit, all of them.

Marja: You mean who they?

Katriina: They...

Sami: Sport—

Katriina: Boys in the sports classes. And then also it feels, they are using it, for example we have one other, a ninth grader black boy, so they use the n-word to him.

Marja: Ah, oh no.

Sami: But I feel that, I don't know. (Boy name) for example wants so much acceptance that he kind of like, accepts it. (...) And then at our school we have so many of those white sporty boys that all the non-white boys are gamer boys and then they're automatically a bit more feminine. Not necessarily more feminine but still feminine.

(Youth club, focus group 7, a trans boy and a girl, both 15 years old, white Finnish background)⁸

According to Sami and Katriina, racist attitudes are common among white Finnish boys, particularly in the specialist sports class, where the boys are affluent and are considered to be at the top of the school hierarchy. Despite sometimes being subjected to racist behavior, Sami suggests that some of the boys from minoritized ethnic groups still seek to be accepted rather than complaining about the racism to which they are subject. According to Sami, the category of white sport boys is so strong and masculine that in comparison, all those he refers to as “non-white” boys are lumped together as “gamer boys,” a category that is viewed in schools as less masculine. In Sami and Katriina's narrative, racism is gendered as a masculine phenomenon and only discussed in relation to boys' behavior and their social hierarchy.

Sami and Katriina provide a starkly different account from Lauri and Onni's. This may be because they come from a different school—they were interviewed at the youth club and their school was not one of the three schools that participated in the study. It may also be, however, because they have a different social understanding and have developed an intersectional racialized/social class analysis. This fits with their narrative that black boys are subjected to racism without having done anything to warrant it and that the black boys do not retaliate, but instead seek “acceptance” from the powerful, white Finnish boys. This was in line with Katriina and Sami's accounts more broadly, as quite exceptionally in the data, they adopted an intersectional view on many of the topics discussed and so were sensitive to differences related to social class, ethnicity, skin color, gender and sexuality.

In both of the above examples, white Finnish masculinity is constructed as the norm, with other masculinities constructed in contrast as either excessive (“macho”/“troublemaker”) or as feminine, something that is commonly found in research on masculinities in many countries (Gottzén, Mellström and Shefer

2020; Hopkins 2006). The difference between the two focus groups presented above, however, is that the trans boy and young woman are critical of this and resist this view.

Distancing Oneself from Racism

In this final empirical section, we take a closer look at the ways in which the young people in the study view racism and their approaches to it.

Racism, generally, was denounced by the interviewees. However, most discussed racism as something vaguely negative (“bad” or “dumb”) and therefore dissociated themselves from it. It was understood largely as an individual-level problem or inconvenience rather than a structural phenomenon. As found by Aminkeng A. Alemanji and Fred Dervin (2016), it was also located outside their own sphere and relegated, for instance, to the adult world or to certain parts of the internet.

Positioning themselves outside of, and untouched by, racism meant that these white Finnish interviewees were able to describe practices that included racist elements without recognizing them as such. One such practice involved joking, which is recognized as an integral part of masculine performativity (Kehily and Nayak 1997; Huuki, Manninen and Sunnari 2010; Barnes 2012). Masculine joking covered a wide array of topics and served multiple purposes. Boys’ backgrounds and appearances, including aspects of minority ethnicity, were frequently part of its focus. For instance, Onni from Kukkula School explained that among his team members—some of whom were from minoritized ethnic groups—saying things that could be considered racist “by someone” was acceptable since “everyone knows” that it “is only joking” and thus not to be taken seriously.

Marja: Have you ever heard that any of them would have faced racism or something, shouting for example in some of your matches?

Onni: No, I haven’t and then just, in the workouts it doesn’t, if someone says something so called that could be in someone’s opinion (racist) so it’s still, we’re all such good friends with each other that it, it just doesn’t influence that in any way, or if, everyone there knows, so if you say something about another so it’s always joking, like in our team, there it’s not worth taking anything seriously, it’s a bit like that.

(Kukkula school, individual interview, Onni, 14 years old, white Finnish background)⁹

This line of thinking was shared by several other boys, and it was emphasized that joking was not targeted disproportionately against minoritized boys because “everyone is dissed equally.” Racist joking was thus equated with other

insulting joking about boys' appearance or behavior. White Finnishness was invisible in that it was left outside joking, which highlights its normative position; at the same time, racist joking was treated as a matter of individual-level insults. Since masculine joking practices include a norm of being able to "take a joke," taking offence would be read as "whining" or being humorless, which would threaten boys' status in the masculine hierarchies (Huuki, Manninen and Sunnari 2010). That masculine norms make it harder to voice opposition to racist joking highlights the value of an intersectional approach in understanding white privilege among young people. Masculine joking practices, for the white Finnish boys, thus enable the use of racist expressions while maintaining a position as "not racist" and the performative maintenance of color-blind egalitarianism.

The interviewees sometimes recognized other people's behaviors as racist. However, in these cases, too, it was possible for the white Finnish boys to hold on to an outsider position in relation to racism, and to minimize its significance. In the quote below, Elmeri from Nurmi School describes brutally racist behavior that his team member has had to endure not only in his football hobby—according to Elmeri because "he's really good at running"—but also in school.

Marja: Have you ever encountered something that people whose origins are somewhere else were treated in a different way than...?

Elmeri: Yeah.

Marja: Okay, where?

Elmeri: Well we have one like a dark-skinned forward. He's really good at running so people always shout at him everything like, go steal bikes and then, everything else a bit racist like this.

Marja: Ok so some opponents shout or?

Elmeri: Opponents and then some parents shout.

Marja: Parents, for real?

Elmeri: Yeah and sometimes in school people throw bananas at him and [laughs] other stuff like this.

Marja: Right. Has your, coach or someone said something about it?

Elmeri: Yes but it doesn't help at all when, they just don't listen.

Marja: Well what do you think about it?

Elmeri: I think it's a bit dumb, but not everyone needs to be friends with everyone.

(Nurmi school, focus group 3, four boys, all 13 years old, three with white Finnish background, one mixed heritage)¹⁰

Elmeri describes these actions as “a bit racist,” but treats them as minor and insignificant. In this narrative, he does not himself take any sort of active position apart from as an observer. He does not express any sense that he should take responsibility for showing opposition to such behavior either during the event or when recounting it in the interview situation. Neither does he expect real opposition or intervention from the coach, whom he agrees did say “something,” but whom he renders powerless by pointing out that the coach cannot help since the people making the racist comments “don’t listen.” When Marja asks him to reflect on the issue himself, Elmeri distances himself from it as something “a bit dumb,” but frames it again as an individual-level problem relating to the nature of people’s relationships. Although he had just described how racist acts have been targeted to a child by adults and he has seen racist acts repeated in different social contexts, he gives no recognition to the power dynamics and repetition and refers to racism as if it only occurs when people are not “friends,” and that it is unreasonable to expect that everyone should be friends.

Doing Intersectional Whiteness and Masculinity

In this chapter, we have analyzed how white Finnish young people—in our study, mostly boys—position themselves and others in their narratives on multiethnicity, and how these positions intersect with their constructions of, and practices related to, masculinities. For many, multiculturalism was an unfamiliar and distant theme. They made sense of it by taking up color-blind egalitarian ideas. While those young people who attended the school with the greatest proportion of white Finnish young people were unfamiliar with the idea of multiculturalism, the presence of minoritized ethnic groups in the participants’ schools did not necessarily make it easier for them to elaborate on this theme.

Most of the participants embraced egalitarian ideals in which it was generally important to represent themselves as people who have positive, open-minded attitudes toward diversity. That their egalitarianism was color blind meant that their narratives included very little recognition of racialized inequalities, and even when such issues were addressed, they were treated as individual rather than structural phenomena. The normative position of white Finnishness was left unrecognized and unquestioned, while it was reproduced and consolidated in implicit assumptions about who had to “blend in,” who needed to be “tolerant” and who caused “trouble.”

The Finnish version of white innocence (Wekker 2016), grounded in the Finnish welfare project and myth of monoculturalism, highlights the nation as egalitarian, while remaining color blind and failing to recognize racialized power relations and inequalities, both historical and contemporary. White innocence can also be found in “multicultural education” in schools, which is supposed to offer pupils the analytical tools for understanding diversity, but (as in multicultural education in other countries) has been found to work in

superficial or even othering ways, leaving white Finns outside of its focus, and lacking content related to racism and anti-racism (Alemanji 2016; Holm and Mansikka 2013). Given that white innocence is a central part of, and reinforces, the Finnish cultural archive, it is not surprising that white Finnish young people draw upon this perspective when making sense of multiethnicity.

The normative position of white Finnishness intersected with white Finnish masculinities to be the unquestioned norm, against which the masculinities of boys from other ethnic groups were often seen as either excessive or feminine. “Doing boy” intersected with the norm of white Finnishness, for instance, in how racialized and racist name-calling was legitimized in the context of joking as masculine performativity. Joking thus allowed the white Finnish boys to accept racist language and use it themselves, while simultaneously holding on to their self-representations as not racist, “tolerant” and egalitarian. A further concrete example of white innocence in action can also be found in how self-identity as egalitarian enabled the participants to treat racism as nothing to do with them, while minimizing and excusing it.

Our analysis of the intersection of white Finnishness and masculinities contributes to what Twine and Gallagher (2008) called the “third wave” of whiteness studies by showing how social categories intersect and mutually constitute one another in nuanced ways. White Finnishness and masculinities both work hegemonically and, to an extent, reinforce each other’s normative position. This does not, however, mean that white innocence, color-blind egalitarianism or other mechanisms enabled by and supporting the normative position of white Finnishness in Finland were only related to masculinity. The intersection of white Finnishness and other social categories is likely to produce different but no less powerful ways of legitimating white Finnishness as normative.

As we discussed in the introduction, there is a recurrent imaginary of young people as a new, “multicultural” generation, who actively participate in recreating Finland as a “multicultural” nation. Our analysis shows that if Finnishness is to be reimagined and recreated as racially more inclusive, it has to disrupt the problematic lines of thought connected with white innocence and complicity with racism by acknowledging that the exclusionary norm of white Finnishness is deeply rooted in young people’s, as well as adults’, everyday practices.

Notes

¹ The translations were done by Linda Sivander, Olli Heiniö and Anna Koi-vukoski as part of their paid internships in the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies in 2017–2018. We are very grateful to all three for their valuable help and to the Collegium for funding this.

² All young people’s names appearing in the text are pseudonyms.

³ K1: Mites sitte, monikulttuurisuus onks se semmonen asia mikä mitenkään näkyy täs koulussa vai?

M/N: Mitä sä tarkoitat?

K1: Se et onks täällä oppilaita erilaisist taustoista ja eri-, etn-...?

M/N: No aika vähän (—) [0:18:16 pp].

M/N: Tarkotat sä uskonnossa vai?

K1: No joko uskonto tai sit jos ajattelee et ois muuttanu jostain muualta tai niitten vanhemmat on muuttanu jostain muualta tai jotaki semmosta?

M2: No, mä en hirveesti tiedä kenenkään syntyperiä. Mä tiedän vaa että, kaks tyyppiä jotka on eri uskonnoissa ja sitte, mä.. Siinä se on.

N1: No mä tiän, mä oon nähny koulun käytävil esim. pari, ihan vaan joku kolme tai neljä, tyyppiä jotka käyttää semmost huivii. Mut ei kukaan varmaan mee sanoo niille, mitään toivottavasti tai tälle. Et on se sillee ihan et kaikki sopeutuu kuitenkin tähän (kouluun) [0:18:59].

⁴ K: (M)ietin vielä noista.. siis tost etnisestä taustasta sun kavereissa nii onks sil mitää väliä että, mikä on jonku ihonväri tai mistä sen vanhemmat on kotosin tai..?

V: Eei. Mulle o vaa pääasia et on hyvä tyyppi ja sit sillee.. hauskat jutut ja tulee toimee. Et se on tavallaa mulleki esim. iha sama jos joku vaika, tykkää jostai baletist ja mä en, mut kuha mä tuun muuten sen kaa toimee.

⁵ K1: Mites muuten täällä koulussa, näkyys monikulttuurisuus täällä (...)?

M2: (...) Ei täällä hirveen monikulttuurista välttämättä.

M1: Kyl täällä on aika paljon, samoja suomalaisia tyyppiä, niinku kaikki, mä nään tosi paljon semmosia kommentteja missä ihmiset valittaa et kuinka monta, maahanmuuttajaa mukamas tässä on ja kaikkee ihan hirveetä, niin mun mielestä, täällä kuitenkin ei oo ees kauheesti eikä, mun mielestä niistä oo mitään haittaa ees. Ja, siis eihän täälläkään kauheesti niitä oo että, ei todellakaan oo kauheesti. (...)

K1: Mites te ajattelette noin niinku yleisesti että, onks sillä väliä että mikä on ihmisen ihonväri tai..

M1: Ei.

M2: Ei mun mielestä.

M1: Se riippuu siitä mitä on siellä sisällä, pään sisällä.

M2: Niin, munkin mielestä, ei sillä oo mitään väliä, että, niinku, mä en tajuu et miten sillä ois mitään väliä, joidenkin mielestä.

⁶ K: Aivan [naurahtaa]. Onks ylipäänsä monikulttuurisuus sulle sellanen asia mikä on sulle sellai tuttu tai ooks sä koskaa ajatellu sitä?

V: On se tuttu koska me matkustellaan niin paljon, niin sitte mä tottakai syön siellä enemmän monikulttuurista ruokaa ja varsinki ku mun vanhemmat ei tykkää ollenkaa tälläsista turistipaikoista, vaikka jostai turistiraflasta. (...)

K: Onks sul jotain mielipidettä siitä et ku Suomi kuitenkin monikulttuuristuu, onks se hyvä vai huono asia vai?

V: No musta se on ihan hyvä asia. Mä oon ainaki varmaa innoissaa siitä että tulee vaikka toi TacoBell, tiedätkö se amerikkalainen ketju nii se tulee nyt Suomeen ja.. mä tykkään siitä et ainaki ruokakulttuurissa et tää Suomi

monikulttuurisoituu. (...) Mut sitte jos ruvetaa käyttämään paljon rahaa, tai siis tosi paljon rahaa uskontoihi, esim vaikka mä olin vähän mielteliäs siitä minkä se olikaan se kappeli... (K: ...se moskeijahanke vai?) Nii siitä, mä olin vähän että aika paljon toho rahaa varmaan menee. Ei se varmaa loppujen lopuks niin paljon, mut se oli heti ensimmäinen ajatus et onks toi nyt iha järkevää. Koska ei täällä varmaa niin paljoo kuitenkaan oo.. et vois ehkä vähän tehdä pienemmä. Mutta nii.

⁷ K: (O)nks tää koulu teijän mielestä ns. monikulttuurinen mitä se nyt sit tarkottaakaan et?

V: On.

V: Joo.

K: Miten sä näkyy tääl vai?

V: Kyl kaikki tota tulee toimeen, mut saattaa jotkut, tietyt, ehkä jos (...) ne jotka on tullu jostain ulkomailta nii ne yrittää ottaa roolia, ainaki jotkut.

V: Niin, tosi paljon.

K: Minkälaisia rooleja?

V: Siis sillei et rupee isottelee iha hirveesti. Just varmaa just sen takii ettei ne ite jäis sen isottelun kohteeks, mut mun mielest sitä ei oo melkein yhtään tääl mun koulussa. En mä nyt sano et kaikki tekee sitä, mut aika usein jos se tulee jostain suunnasta nii yleensä se on maahanmuuttajista. (...)

K: Jos ajattelee tota opettajii nii näkyys se niitten suhtautumises mitenkää, se että ihmiset tulee eri taustoista? Onks se ns. tasa-arvosta se kohtelu täällä?

V: Se vähä riippuu, saattaa olla vähä tiukempi ulkomaalaisille. Mut se saattaa kyllä johtuu niitten käytöksestä.

⁸ V1: Meil on älyttömän valkoinen koulu, tai siis Suomi ylipäätänsä on tosi valkoinen. Nii sit varsinki urheiluluokka, ne on kaikki valkosii. (...)

V2: Sit kans et, ne on kaikki suht varakkaita ne urheiluluokkalaiset. (...)

V1: Nii ne on kaikki aika varakkait, niil on aina kaikki uudet vaatteet ja uusia vaatteita lisää ja (...) hyvät kännykät ja kaikkea muut tommosta. (...)

V2: Onhan se vähän, sit kans ku ne on... mä en tiää onks ne nyt rasistisii vai ei, ku ne... no vaikuttaa vähän silt et ne on (rasistisia), ainaki vähän, kaikki.

K: Siis ketkä ne?

V2: Ne..

V1: ..Urheilu..

V2: ..urheiluluokkalaiset pojat. Ja sit kans tuntuu et ne käyttää just sitä esim. meil on yks toinen ysiluokkalainen musta poika, nii sille sanotaan n-sanaa.

K: Aa, voi ei.

V1: Mut must tuntuu et, emmä tiää, (pojan nimi) esim. halua niin paljon hyväksyntää et se vähän niinku hyväksyy sen. (...) Sit meiän koulu meil on nii paljo niit valkosii urheilupoikii et kaikki ei-valkoset on pelaajapoikii ja sit ne on automaattisesti vähän feminiinisempiä. Ei välttämät feminiinisempii mut feminiinisiä kuitenkin.

⁹ K: Ooks sä koskaa kuullu et kukaa niist kohtais jotain rasismii tai jotain, huuteluu vaik jossain teiän matseis?

V: Ei, en oo ja sitte just, treeneissäki ni ei se, jos joku sanoo jotain ns. mikä vois olla jonku mielestä (rasistista) ni se on kumminki, me ollaa kaikki niin hyvii kavereit keskenää et se, se vaan et se ei vaikuta millään tavalla et, tai jos, jokanen siellä, ni jos sanoo jotain toisesta ni se on aina vitsiä, et meidän joukkuees, siel ei kannata ottaa mitään tosissaan, se on vähän sellanen.

¹⁰ K: Ootteks te koskaan törmänny semmoseen et kohdeltais eri tavalla ihmisiä jotka on jostain muualta kun-

M4: Joo, (—) [0:19:52 hp].

K: Okei, missä?

M4: No kun meillä on yks semmonen tummaihonen hyökkääjä. Se on tosi kova juokseen niin sille aina huudetaan kaikkee että, mee varasteleen pyöriä ja sitten, kaikkee muuta tällästä vähän rasistista.

K: Okei, siis huutelee jotkut vastustajat vai?

M4: Vastustajat ja sitten huutelee jotkut vanhemmat.

K: Vanhemmat, oikeesti?

M4: Joo ja sitä heitetään joskus koulussa aina heitetään välillä banaanilla ja [naurahtaa] muuta tällästä.

K: Just joo. Onks se teiän, valmentaja tai joku sanonu siit jotain?

M4: On mut eihän se mitään auta kun, ne ei vaan kuuntele.

K: No mitäs sä ajattelet siitä?

M4: Mun mielest se on vähän tyhmää mut, ei kaikkien tarvi olla kaikkien kaa kavereita.

References

- Alemanji, A. A. 2016. *Is There Such a Thing...? A Study of Antiracism Education in Finland*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Alemanji, A. A. and F. Dervin. 2016. "If an Apple Is a Foreign Apple You Have to Wash It Very Carefully": Youth Discourses on Racism." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 11 (3): 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197916648284>
- Allport, G. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arnesen, A.-L., E. Lahelma and E. Öhrn. 2008. "Travelling Discourses on Gender and Education: The Case of Boys' Underachievement." *Nordisk pedagogik* 1: 1–14.
- Barnes, C. 2012. "It's No Laughing Matter... Boys' Humour and the Performance of Defensive Masculinities in the Classroom." *Journal of Gender Studies* 21 (3): 239–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2012.691648>
- Bernelius, V. and M. Vaattovaara. 2016. "Choice and Segregation in the 'Most Egalitarian' Schools: Cumulative Decline in Urban Schools and Neighbourhoods of Helsinki, Finland." *Urban Studies* 53 (15): 3155–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098015621441>

- Bonilla-Silva, E. 2003. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. and D. Dietrich. 2011. "The Sweet Enchantment of Color-Blind Racism in Obamerica." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 634 (1): 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716210389702>
- Carrigan, T., B. Connell and J. Lee. 1985. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." *Theory and Society* 14 (5): 551–604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00160017>
- City of Helsinki. 2019. *Helsinki's Present State and Development 2019* [available online at: https://www.hel.fi/hel2/tietokeskus/julkaisut/pdf/19_08_27_Helsinki_presentstate_and_development_2019.pdf, last accessed June 22, 2021].
- Cohen, P. 1988. "The Perversions of Inheritance: Studies in the Making of Multi-Racist Britain." In *Multi-Racist Britain*, edited by P. Cohen and H. S. Bains, 9–118. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-19399-8_2
- Collins, P. H. 2019. *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Crenshaw, K. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989 (1): 139–67. <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>
- DiAngelo, R. 2006. "'I'm Leaving,' White Fragility in Racial Dialogues." In *Inclusion in Urban Educational Environments: Addressing Issues of Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice*, edited by D. E. Armstrong and B. J. McMahon, 213–40. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1920 [1910]. "The Souls of White Folk: The Independent." In *Darkwater: Voices Within the Veil*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- Fine M., L. Weis, L. C. Powell and L. Mun Wong, eds. 1997. *Off White*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Frankenberg, R. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frosh, S., A. Phoenix and R. Pattman. 2002. *Young Masculinities*. London: Palgrave.
- Frye, M. 1983. "On Being White: Thinking toward a Feminist Understanding of Race and Race Supremacy." In *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. Los Angeles, CA: The Crossing Press.
- Gillborn, D. 2019. "Hiding in Plain Sight: Understanding and Addressing Whiteness and Color-Blind Ideology in Education." *Kappa Delta Pi Record* 55 (3): 112–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2019.1622376>
- Gottzén, L., U. Mellström and T. Shefer, eds. 2020. *Routledge International Handbook of Masculinity Studies*. London: Routledge.

- Gramsci, A. 2006 [1971]. "Hegemony, Intellectuals and the State." In *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader*, edited by J. Storey, 85–92. Harlow: Pearson.
- Gross, C., A. Gottburgsen and A. Phoenix. 2016. "Education Systems and Intersectionality." In *Education Systems and Inequalities*, edited by A. Hadjar and C. Gross, 51–72. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Hall, S. 1997. "The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity." In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by A. D. King, 19–40. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Haywood, C., T. Johansson, N. Hammarén, M. Herz and A. Ottemo. 2018. *The Conundrum of Masculinity: Hegemony, Homosociality, Homophobia and Heteronormativity*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Hearn, J. 2015. "Transnational Reflections on Transnational Research Projects on Men, Boys and Gender Relations." *Norma—Nordic Journal for Masculinities Studies* 10 (2): 86–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18902138.2015.1050858>
- Holm, G. and J.-E. Mansikka. 2013. "Multicultural Education as Policy and Praxis in Finland: Heading in a Problematic Direction?" *Recherches en education* 2013 (16): 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ree.7783>
- hooks, b. 1992. *Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hopkins, P. E. 2006. "Youthful Muslim Masculinities: Gender and Generational Relations." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31 (3): 337–52.
- Huuki, T., S. Manninen and V. Sunnari. 2010. "Humour as a Resource and Strategy for Boys to Gain Status in the Field of Informal School." *Gender and Education* 22 (4): 369–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250903352317>
- Janssen, D. F. 2015. "After Boyology, Or, Whence and Whither Boyhood Studies?" *Boyhood Studies* 8 (1): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3167/bhs.2015.080101>
- Juva, I. and G. Holm. 2017. "Not All Students Are Equally Equal: Normality as Finnishness." In *The State, Schooling, and Identity: Diversifying Education in Europe*, edited by K. Kantasalmi and G. Holm, 213–32. Singapore: Palgrave.
- Kehily, M. J. and A. Nayak. 1997. "'Lads and Laughter': Humour and the Production of Heterosexual Hierarchies." *Gender and Education* 9 (1): 69–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540259721466>
- Keskinen, S. 2018. "The 'Crisis' of White Hegemony, Neonationalist Femininities and Antiracist Feminism." *Women's Studies International Forum* 68: 157–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2017.11.001>
- Keskinen, S. 2019. "Intra-Nordic Differences, Colonial/Racial Histories, and National Narratives: Rewriting Finnish History." *Scandinavian Studies* 91 (1–2): 163–81. <https://doi.org/10.5406/scanstud.91.1-2.0163>
- Kimanen, A. 2018. "Approaching Culture, Negotiating Practice: Finnish Educators' Discourses on Cultural Diversity." *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 13 (4): 334–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2018.1546309>

- Kosunen, S. 2016. *Families and the Social Space of School Choice in Urban Finland*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Kovel, J. 1984. *White Racism: A Psychohistory*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Layne, H. 2016. "Contact Zones" in Finnish (Intercultural) Education. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Leonardo, Z. 2009. *Race, Whiteness, and Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Luttrell, W. 2020. *Children Framing Childhoods: Working-Class Kids' Visions of Care*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Mac an Ghaill, M. and C. Haywood. 2014. "Pakistani and Bangladeshi Young Men: Re-racialization, Class and Masculinity within the Neo-liberal School." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 35 (5): 753–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2014.919848>
- Manninen, S., T. Huuki and V. Sunnari. 2011. "Earn Yo'respect! Respect in the Status Struggle of Finnish School Boys." *Men and Masculinities* 14 (3): 335–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X10369476>
- McCormack, M., 2011. "Hierarchy without Hegemony: Locating Boys in an Inclusive School Setting." *Sociological Perspectives* 54 (1): 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sop.2011.54.1.83>
- McIntosh, P. 1988. "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." In *White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies*. Wellesley MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women [available online at: <https://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/mcintosh.pdf>, last accessed 30 May 2020].
- Mellström, U. 2014. "Multidimensional Masculinities." *Norma—Nordic Journal for Masculinity Studies* 9 (2): 81–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18902138.2014.910328>
- Morrison, T. 1994. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nayak, A. 2007. "Critical Whiteness Studies." *Sociology Compass* 1 (2): 737–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00045.x>
- Nortio, E., T. A. Renvik and I. Jasinskaja-Lahti. 2020. "As a Native Person, Why Should I Adapt?": A Multimethod Approach to Majority Finns' Attitudes towards Multiculturalism." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 10 (2): 20–35. <http://doi.org/10.33134/njmr.135>
- Nortio, E., S. Varjonen, T. A. Mähönen and I. Jasinskaja-Lahti. 2016. "Interpretative Repertoires of Multiculturalism—Supporting and Challenging Hierarchical Intergroup Relations." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 4 (2): 623–45. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v4i2.639>
- OSF Official Statistics Finland. 2021. *Population Structure*. [available online at https://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/index_en.html, last accessed January 10, 2022.]

- Phoenix, A., 2008. "Racialised Young Masculinities: Doing Intersectionality at School." In *Ethnische Diversitäten, Gender und Schule: Geschlechterverhältnisse in Theorie und Schulischer Praxis*, edited by M. Seemann, 19–39. Oldenburg, Germany: BIS-Verlag.
- Phoenix, A. and P. Pattynama. 2006. "Intersectionality." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 187–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065751>
- Pratt, M. L. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* 1991: 33–40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25595469>
- Rattansi, A. 2020. *Racism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roediger, D. R. and R. Capotorto. 2003. *Are Italians White? How Race Is Made in America*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rothenberg, P. 2000. *Invisible Privilege: A Memoir about Race, Class, and Gender*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Schofield, J. W. 1986. "Causes and Consequences of the Colorblind Perspective." In *Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism: Theory and Practice*, edited by S. Gaertner and J. Dovidio, 231–53. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Scott-Baumann, A., M. Guest, S. Naguib, S. Cherurallil-Contractor, A. Phoenix, T. Al Bagual and L. Yenn. 2020. *Islam on Campus: Contested Identities and the Cultures of Higher Education in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tervonen, M. 2014. "Historiankirjoitus ja myytti yhden kulttuurin Suomesta." In *Kotiseutu ja kansakunta: Miten suomalaista historiaa on rakennettu*, edited by P. Markkola, H. Snellman and A. C. Östman, 137–62. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Tolonen, T. 2018. "Minority Young Men's Gendered Tactics for Making Space in the City and at School." *Gender and Education* 31 (3): 408–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2018.1496228>
- Törrönen, J. and F. Roumeliotis. 2014. "Masculinities of Drinking as Described by Swedish and Finnish Age-Based Focus Groups." *Addiction Research & Theory* 22 (2): 126–36. <https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2013.785533>
- Twine, F. W. and C. Gallagher. 2008. "The Future of Whiteness: A Map of the 'Third Wave.'" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31 (1): 4–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701538836>
- van Ausdale, D. and J. R. Feagin. 2001. *The First R: How Children Learn Race and Racism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wekker, G. 2016. *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*. Amsterdam: Duke University Press.
- Wise, T. 2010. *Colorblind: The Rise of Post-Racial Politics and the Retreat from Racial Equity*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.
- Zajonc, R. B. 1968. "Attitudinal Effects of Mere Exposure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 9 (2): 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025848>