LIFE BEFORE THE PASSPORT

People with a Refugee Background Navigating Everyday Life, Temporalities and Subjectivities between Refugeehood and Citizenship

Camilla Marucco Al-Mimar

LIFE BEFORE
THE PASSPORT

People with a Refugee Background Navigating
Everyday Life, Temporalities and Subjectivities
between Refugeehood and Citizenship

Camilla Marucco Al-Mimar

University of Turku

Faculty of Science
Department of Geography and Geology
Human Geography
Doctoral programme in Biology, Geography and Geology

Supervised by

Associate professor Eveliina Lyytinen
Migration Institute of Finland
Turku, Finland

Associate professor Elli Heikkilä
Migration Institute of Finland
Turku, Finland

Professor Jussi Jauhiainen
University of Turku
Turku, Finland

Reviewed by

Professor Jennifer Hyndman
York University
Toronto, Canada

Professor Banu Gökarıksel
The University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, US

Opponent

Adjunct professor Anna-Kaisa Kuusisto
Tampere University
Tampere, Finland

The originality of this publication has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

Cover Image: The shortcut to the Pansio camp, Turku, winter 2016, Camilla Marucco Al-Mimar

To all those pursuing
the right to move, to stay, to live.

UNIVERSITY OF TURKU
Faculty of Science
Department of Geography and Geology
Human geography
CAMILLA MARUCCO AL-MIMAR: Life Before the Passport. People with a
Refugee Background Navigating Everyday Life, Temporalities and
Subjectivities between Refugeehood and Citizenship
Doctoral Dissertation, 169 pp.
Doctoral Programme in Biology, Geography and Geology
May 2024

ABSTRACT

In this PhD dissertation thesis, I explore how people with a refugee background living in Turku, Finland, define, live and perform their everyday temporalities between refugeehood and citizenship. I focus on people who identify as experiencing or having experienced refugeehood. The thesis has two aims: to study how people with a refugee background practise their agency even before officialising their legal status, and to re-centre these people's lives *vis à vis* the tyranny of "papers" and legal categorisations. Migration and citizenship regimes perpetrate temporal injustices in the lives of people with a refugee background. Through empirical studies and autoethnographical reflections, I examine three research questions: What are the common priorities and temporalities of people with a refugee background? What do these temporalities imply for migrants' integration and subjectivities in Finland? What are the methodological implications of this thesis? I theorise refugeehood and citizenship as the two mutually constitutive sides of a spatio-temporal continuum along which people move through various dimensions of their lives (legal status, employment, family life, racialisation). I build on discussions on ethics in forced-migration research and from feminist and critical geographies to re–centre researchers' humanity in academic work. The results show that people with a refugee background practise political agency regardless of their legal status. My research challenges the linear temporalities of integration, revealing how the state segregates the subjectivities of people with a refugee background, affecting their daily lives in Finland and beyond. Lastly, my work suggests that some researchers segregate their academic work from their humanity and activism: I invite researchers to reflect on their situatedness and subjectivities to resist methodological nationalism and unjust immigration regimes.

KEYWORDS: refugeehood, citizenship, temporalities, auto/ethnographic methods, research ethics, activism

TIIVISTELMÄ

Tutkin väitöskirjassani sitä, miten Turussa, Suomessa asuvat pakolaistaustaiset ihmi-
set määrittelevät ja elävät arkielämänsä ajallisuuksia pakolaisuuden ja kansalai-
suuden välillä. Viittaamalla "pakolaistaustaisiin ihmisiin" tarkoitan ihmisiä, jotka
tuntevat ja kokevat pakolaisuutta. Väitöskirjallani on kaksi tavoitetta: tutkin sitä,
miten pakolaistaustaiset ihmiset käyttävät toimijuuttaan jopa ennen heidän
oikeudellisen statuksensa virallistamista sekä asetan pakolaistaustaisten ihmisten
elämän oleskelulupien, passien ja oikeudellisen kategorisoinnin sortavien käytän-
teiden edelle. Maahanmuuttoa ja kansalaisuutta koskevat järjestelmät aiheuttavat
ajallisia epäoikeudenmukaisuuksia pakolaistaustaisten ihmisten elämään. Empiiri-
sen tutkimuksen ja autoetnografisten pohdintojen avulla vastaan seuraaviin tutki-
muskysymyksiin: Mitkä ovat eri pakolaistaustaisten ihmisten yleiset tavoitteet ja
heitä koskevat ajallisuudet? Mitä nämä ajallisuudet merkitsevät heidän kotoutu-
miseensa ja subjektiivisuuksiinsa Suomessa? Mitä metodologisia merkityksiä
väitöskirjallani on? Teoretisoin pakolaisuutta ja kansalaisuutta keskenään muodostu-
vina käsitteinä, aika-tilallisen jatkumon puolina. Ihmiset kulkevat tällä jatkumolla
eri suuntiin elämänsä eri ulottuvuuksissa (oikeudellinen status, työllistyminen,
perhe-elämä, rodullistaminen). Metodologiassani tukeudun keskusteluihin etiikasta
pakkomuuton tutkimuksessa sekä feministisessä ja kriittisessä maantieteessä. Tuon
tutkijoiden inhimillisyyden akateemisen työn ytimeen. Väitöskirjani tulokset
osoittavat, että pakolaistaustaiset ihmiset toteuttavat poliittista toimijuuttaan riippu-
matta heidän oikeudellisista statuksistaan. Tutkimukseni haastaa kotoutumisen
lineaariset ajallisuudet ja valaisee sitä, miten valtio pyrkii erottamaan pakolais-
taustaisten ihmisten subjektiivisuudet toisistaan, vaikuttaen heidän arkipäiväänsä
Suomessa ja muuallakin. Lopuksi, väitöskirjani osoittaa, miten jotkut tutkijat eriyttä-
vät akateemisen tutkimustyönsä inhimillisyydestä ja aktivismista. Tutkimustulok-
seni perusteella kutsun tutkijoita pohtimaan omaa sijaintiaan ja subjektiivisuuksiaan
vastustamaan metodologista nationalismia ja epäoikeudenmukaista maahanmuuton
hallintaa.

AVAINSANAT: pakolaisuus, kansalaisuus, ajallisuus, autoetnografiset menetelmät,
tutkimusetiikka, aktivismi.

Acknowledgements

This book is one the products of nine years of work and community relations. It is one text among many, and written texts are one among the many fruits of the work of some precious communities that I am lucky and proud to be part of. This book would not be here – and I would not be the same here now – hadn't it been for them. I apologise in advance in case I forget to mention here someone who contributed to this: still, their contribution is not forgotten otherwise.

First of all I want to thank the many people arrived to Finland through refugeehood – participants, gatekeepers, acquaintances, friends, activists – who have honoured me with their time, space, trust, presence and knowledge. I cheer to your resistance, your dignity and your lives!

People of We See You and Kaikkien Naisten Talo: you are unbelievable, I would be much less of a human, an activist and a researcher without you.

This research would have never even started hadn't it been for two brilliant and passionate women and geographers who encouraged me to do research: Eveliina, thank you for being an incredible supervisor, for teaching me the value and beauty of ethics and for being so selflessly committed to my learning. Elli, thank you for your wonderful enthusiasm, guidance and generosity during all these years.

Hille Koskela, thank you for advising me in the beginning of my research journey; your texts about women's emotions and uses of space were among my first geographical readings. Jussi Jauhiainen, thank you for accepting to ferry me towards the conclusion of this dissertation process.

Professor Jennifer Hyndman and Professor Banu Gökarıksel: it has been an incredible privilege to have my thesis pre-examined by you two. Your work is a huge inspiration for me. You have made me feel understood and welcome among academics. I really hope to meet you and collaborate with you one day. Adjunct Professor Anna-Kaisa Kuusisto: I first met you in a workshop at the University of Tampere in 2015 and I was struck by your care for people's lives, bodies, feelings. I feel immensely lucky to have you as my opponent.

To my mentors, colleagues and friends Anitta Kynsilehto and Leonardo Custódio: I don't know if you know how crucial you and your work have been for

Thank you all friends and dear ones who have believed in me and with me in the chance of making better worlds through everyday humanity, activism and research. Importantly, a huge thank to all my family for always, enthusiastically supporting me no matter what, and for the openness, care and empathy towards my efforts. Thank you Tufi, love of my life: your courage and dignity are just unbelievable. Thank you for all that you let me learn with and from you, and for always encouraging me to do what I believe in, no matter what.

May 9th, 2024
Camilla Marucco Al-Mimar

Table of Contents

List of Original Publications

This dissertation is based on the following original publications, which are referred to in the text by their Roman numerals:

I   Marucco, C. Integration and segregation through leisure: The case of Finnish Somalis in Turku. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 2020; 10(3): 90-104. doi: https://doi.org/10.33134/njmr.327

II   Marucco, C. Temporalities of citizenship among Finnish Somali women: Simultaneities, disruptions and accelerations along the refugeeness-citizenship continuum. *Citizenship Studies*, 2022; 26(1): 107-126. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2021.2010655

III   Marucco Al-Mimar, C. Life before the paper: Embodying feminist theories through asylum activism. Submitted manuscript.

1   Introduction

When discussing refugeehood, one key question is how to end it, how can a person secure a legal status and a safe, peaceful everyday life. By 'refugeehood' I refer to the processes, experiences and agencies not only of people who have received an official refugee status, but more generally of people who have lived or are living through forced migration, displacement, camps; this includes people who arrived in the European Union or Finland as quota refugees, by applying for asylum or through family reunification (**Article II**: 108). I approach refugeehood as a broad concept linked with ideas and experiences of deportability (De Genova, 2002), waiting (Jacobsen, Karlsen and Khosravi, 2021), detention (Mountz, 2011), of holding an underprivileged passport – or none –, of having scarce or no access to safe and free international mobility and to the protection offered by citizenship (Hyndman and Giles, 2011: 366).

Both in the law and in the imagination of many people, refugeehood is a linear process which ends after one receives the passport of the country of asylum. However, the passport does not tell everything. Even *after* obtaining asylum or a residence permit or accessing the apparently universal realm of citizenship (Ambrosini, 2012: 14), the agencies of people with a refugee background may remain restricted in certain dimensions of their everyday life – for example these people may still face legal obstacles, discrimination and racism. Likewise, people live, pursue their priorities and experience various forms of participation even *before* receiving a residence permit (Marucco, 2017, 2018). *When* does refugeehood end, or does it end, and for whom? (Lyytinen, 2019: 22) These questions remain partly unanswered not only in policy decisions and public discussions, but also among critical geographers (Mitchell, Jones and Fluri, 2019: 3).

To answer these questions, I claim, it is paramount to attend to the priorities and temporalities of people with a refugee background in their *here and now* and *over time*. By "people with a refugee background", I refer to people who identify as experiencing or having experienced some aspect of refugeehood. By temporalities, I refer to people's relations with and their lived experiences of time: I see temporalities as embedded in power relations and as being related to the production, transformation and negotiation of subjectivities. In this thesis, I explore how people

with a refugee background define, live and perform their everyday temporalities between refugeehood and citizenship – and beyond. I examine these topics through empirical studies and autoethnographical reflections conducted in Turku, Finland, between 2016 and 2019. Starting from the idea that refugeehood and citizenship are mutually constitutive (Kapur, 2007), I imagine refugeehood and citizenship as the two sides of a spatio-temporal continuum, along which people may move and position themselves in various ways – sequentially or simultaneously – with regard to different dimensions of their lives.

In this thesis, I have endeavoured to understand the priorities and temporalities of various people with a refugee background living in Finland. The title of this work, "*Life before the passport*", has a dual meaning: from one side, it explores how people with a refugee background may practise their agency even before achieving an official legal status; and from the other side, it undertakes to prioritise and re-centre human life over "papers" and legal categorisations (Brankamp and Weima, 2021: 2).

Such an approach is necessary because migration and citizenship regimes perpetrate temporal injustices and steal time from the lives of people with a refugee background (Thorshaug and Brun, 2019; Khosravi, 2019). The time of these people is treated as being less worthy than the time of native citizens and residents who are e.g. racially, sexually and culturally privileged (Khosravi, 2021: 204; Kapur, 2007). The temporalities of people with a refugee background reveal how citizenship can protect some people in certain contexts from the pervasive control that the state and immigration regimes exert over their time (Anderson, 2021: 227). In addition, approaching temporalities through the very definitions, experiences and priorities of people with a refugee background is necessary in order to avoid essentialising their agencies and to resist the bordering practices of the state (Khosravi, 2021: 205).

By re-centring the voices and experiences of people, I hope to contribute to challenging the linear temporalities of immigration, integration and citizenship that are produced by the state and which maintain, and are maintained by, methodological nationalism (Drangsland, 2021; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). Because researchers are always embedded and situated in the topics they study and within the world in general, this thesis also interrogates the temporalities, subjectivities and agencies of geographers and researchers at large, with a view to inspiring more people towards more critical ethics and praxis (Brankamp and Weima, 2021; Drangsland, 2021: 76).

This thesis is situated in feminist, radical and critical geographies; it builds on the burgeoning multidisciplinary literature on migration and temporalities, and combines the geographical literature about activism with works on ethics and advocacy in forced-migration research.

1.1 Main claim and research questions

This thesis presents three main arguments. First, I argue that people with a refugee background enact their agencies, also politically, in various ways whatever their legal status may be. Depending on their priorities and their positionings, their integration paths may see accelerations, stalemates, disruptions and advancements at different times or simultaneously in different dimensions of their lives.

My second argument is that global and national migration regimes produce segregated subjectivities for people with a refugee background and people on the move more broadly. In other words, national, international and global migration laws and politics "outline the subject positions available to [people] *as* asylum seekers and refugees" (Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021: 5). Such laws and politics push many people with a refugee background to prioritise only one of their multiple subjectivities in order to obtain and retain the right to stay in their new country. In response, people with a refugee background enact creative temporal strategies in relation to their subjectivities, for example as refugees, workers, students and/or family members. The segregation of subjectivities bears both temporal and spatial consequences for the agencies of people with a refugee background, in their everyday life and over time.

Thirdly, I argue that all researchers as humans and members of society, and not only those working with refugees and refugeehood, should critically reflect on their own multiple subjectivities in order to resist methodological nationalism and the associated national immigration regimes.

Based on my own reflections on the scientific literature, and on the definitions, experiences and priorities that various people with a refugee background have shared with me in recent years in Turku, this thesis explores the following research questions:

1. What are the common priorities and temporalities along the refugeehood–citizenship continuum of people with a refugee background, i.e. across legal status, what allows people to move towards citizenship and the experience of having fuller control over their everyday time? What restricts their spatio-temporal agency and impels them towards refugeehood?

2. From a theoretical point of view, what do these temporalities imply for the integration and subjectivities of migrants in Finland?

3. What are the methodological implications of the present thesis and research process?

I explore these questions using the empirical example of people with a refugee background who were originally from Somalia and Iraq and who now live in Turku,

Finland. I have formulated these questions during my doctoral process with a view to bringing together the three articles included in this thesis. The articles complement each other in addressing these three different questions, although Research Question 3 is only explicitly addressed in Article III. However, my methodology and knowledge, which I also examine in Article III, have significantly developed thanks to the work I have done when writing Articles I and II.

In this thesis, I explore the three research questions presented above mainly by using the concepts of temporalities, the refugeehood-citizenship continuum and segregation. In the articles, I occasionally employ various other concepts to analyse the everyday agencies of people with a refugee background (for the main themes and concepts of the articles, see the next section, 1.2.; for the methodologies, see 3.1.).

1.2   Overview of the article-specific themes

This thesis consists of the synopsis and of three original articles. The main common themes for each article that I discuss in this synopsis are the following:

Article I: "Integration and segregation through leisure: the case of Finnish Somalis in Turku":

1. Spatial segregation (see theoretical framework, 2.3.)

2. Racism (see discussion, 4.1.4.)

3. Leisure time and its relations with other dimensions of everyday life (see discussion, 4.1.2. and 4.1.3.)

Article II: "Temporalities of citizenship among Finnish Somali women: simultaneities, disruptions and accelerations along the refugeehood-citizenship continuum":

1. Refugeehood-citizenship continuum (see theoretical framework, 2.2.2., and the discussion in Chapter, 4.)

2. Linear temporalities of integration and the subjectivities for Somali women (see theoretical framework, 2.2., and discussion, 4.2.)

3. Living between passports, global and local mobilities (see discussion, 4.1.1.)

Article III: "Life before the paper: embodying feminist theories through asylum activism":

1. Spatio-temporally segregated subjectivities among geographers (see methodology, 3.2.2., and discussion, 4.3.)

2. Conducting research and activism about asylum (see methodology, 3.2., and discussion, 4.3.)

3. The entanglements of temporalities and ethics (see methodology, 3.2.3., and discussion, 4.3.1.)

In addition, this doctoral thesis draws on knowledge which may not appear directly in the three articles, but that has been important in shaping and informing both my articles and this thesis. Between August 2016 and June 2017, as part of the URMI project (Urbanization, Mobilities and Immigration, funded by the Strategic Research Council at the Academy of Finland), I conducted research about the everyday priorities of Iraqi men arrived in Finland as asylum seekers in 2015 (Marucco, 2017). Moreover, up to date I have been participating in various forms of so-called activism – from political influencing, to legal lay assistance and everyday care – for fairer asylum policies and processes. My participation has been in conjunction with the We See You association (from autumn 2016 onwards) and the project Every Woman's Centre in Turku (from summer 2017 onwards) (**Article III**). Between August 2021 and January 2023, I was part of a research team who studied the implementation of the social rights of undocumented people in Finland (Katisko *et al.*, 2023; the study was commissioned by the Finnish Prime Minister's Office). Thus, my knowledge and methodology have been shaped by research, activism and my own everyday interactions with people navigating asylum, residence permits, deportability and undocumentedness[1] in various positions.

1.3   Overview of the dissertation

In the remainder of this chapter, I briefly relate the history of this thesis using autobiography; this is a method employed in feminist geography, and other fields, which helps in an understanding of how the researcher's background and lived experiences have influenced the produced knowledge (Haji Molana, 2019). Then, I introduce the research participants – the people with a refugee background whose lives are the concern of this thesis.

In the following chapter (2.), I illustrate the theoretical framework for this research, focusing on the concepts of temporalities, refugeehood and citizenship, and

---

[1]   By the term "undocumentedness", I refer to the condition of people living, for example in Finland, without a residence permit – or having to use the services organised for undocumented people to have their social and health rights implemented, at least to some extent (Katisko *et al.*, 2023: 19). *What* constitutes undocumentedness and *who* lives in such a condition changes through time and space, depending on how people define and perceive undocumentedness. In addition, it also depends on the legal framework and on how the services for undocumented people are organised in each Finnish municipality (ibid.). Moreover, different people from various legal backgrounds can become undocumented or manage to exit the state of undocumentedness: for an example of the current Finnish context, see Katisko *et al.*, 2023: 20–23.

segregation. Subsequently, in the third chapter, I describe the data and methods for the three articles, the ethics of this research, and my methodological approach combining research and activism.

In the fourth chapter, I substantiate my claims that people with a refugee background practice their agencies regardless of their legal status, and despite national immigration and integration regimes producing linear temporalities and segregated subjectivities for people with a refugee background. In addition, in this chapter, I illustrate how segregated subjectivities are also produced among researchers, thus thwarting political communication and opportunities to collaborate for social justice among people with a refugee background and others. I do so by discussing the main findings of the articles in the light of the theoretical framework and methodology of this thesis, focusing on the main themes which are common to all three articles.

In the conclusions (5.), I summarise the findings, highlight the main contributions and limitations of this thesis and offer suggestions for further research.

1.3.1   History and context of the thesis

Initially, my doctoral research was not about the theme under which I write this synopsis. Every research process develops and can also change profoundly. In my case, in 2015 I began with the initial idea of researching experiences, meanings and definitions of citizenship among people with a Somali background both in Finland, where I live, and in Italy, where I come from. I was planning to carry out this doctoral research alone, independently, not as part of a research project and team. My position as a doctoral researcher was not funded, therefore I had to apply for funding almost every year between 2015 and 2019, with one or two exceptions.

Following the Finnish parliamentary elections in 2015, a centre-right government was formed. During that summer, more than 32,000 people arrived in Finland seeking protection: among these, 20,484 people came from Iraq, 5,214 from Afghanistan and 1,981 from Somalia (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023i). In a reaction to this situation, between 2016 and 2018, Finnish laws, practices and interpretations concerning international protection and other residence permits were taken to an increasingly restrictive direction by many politicians, the Finnish Immigration Office (hence Migri)[2] and often the law courts (**Article III;** Pirkkalainen, Lyytinen and Pellander, 2022: 3; Wiik, Skogman and Bäckman, 2019: 199–203).

---

[2]   In English, Migri is called the "Finnish Immigration Service", but I refuse to use this name as I do not see Migri as service serving people, but rather as an integral part of the national immigration system, i.e. as an office controlling immigration.

Finland participated in the "race to the bottom" which weakened the recognition and implementation of the rights of refugees and other people on the move (Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021: 229). This trend was common to all the Nordic countries, where the possibilities for refugees to receive permanent international protection have been increasingly restricted, especially after 2015: as elsewhere, also in Finland asylum processes became more protracted and complex, with fewer and fewer asylum seekers being granted international protection (Näre, Bendixsen and Maury, 2022: 3).

Preoccupied with reducing the numbers of people seeking asylum, the majority of Finnish political discourses portrayed people seeking asylum as a generalised mass, thus overlooking the individuality so central to evaluating the need for protection (Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021: 231). This process stripped various people of their identities as individuals and re-subjectified (i.e. remade) them as a group (Mountz, 2011: 386). In other words, the Finnish authorities and asylum system have made "the biographies of these individuals invisible", with effects that have both legal and existential repercussions for them (Fontanari, 2017: 47). Such conceptions and the ensuing legal reforms focused on those who, in the view of many Finnish politicians and authorities, should not be granted international protection (Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021: 231).

As a result, it became increasingly difficult to receive international protection and to obtain other residence permits, for example permits based on work, studies or family ties (Amnesty International, 2023; Näre and Jokela, 2023: 167). In other words, the Finnish immigration system produced a mounting undocumentedness, i.e. the changes in the law and in Migri's practice led to progressively more people receiving negative decisions to their asylum and permit applications compared to the previous years (Ahonen and Kallius, 2019; Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021: 233). These politics have been testified and examined by people in an array of subject positions – people seeking asylum, researchers, jurists, NGO workers, social work and health care professionals, volunteers and others (Majamaa *et al.*, 2019; Saarikkomäki *et al.*, 2018; Every Woman's Centre, n.d.; Free Movement Network, n.d.; Refugee Radio, n.d.; Stop Deportations, n.d., formerly called Right To Live; Support for Asylum Seekers, n.d.; The Finnish Refugee Advice Centre, n.d.; We See You, n.d.).

Following the changes in the legislation and in the practices related to asylum and permits, there was no certainty that people in need of international protection would be granted this status (Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021: 232). Meanwhile, deportations and "forced voluntary returns" were carried out (Kynsilehto, 2014), including some to unsafe circumstances. The third sector, activists and experts of different backgrounds, including deportable people themselves, had a fundamental role in bringing these deportations to the attention of the public and in organising against them (Horsti, 2017). The ensuing humanitarian crisis is continuing today,

with many people who arrived around 2015 as asylum seekers even now living in undocumentedness (Katisko *et al.*, 2023: 20; Lupa Elää, 2021).

Returning to my doctoral research, in 2016, my topic took two main turns, one in relation to my encounters with many different people and one in relation to having to obtain research funding. Starting in the spring of 2016, as a fellow human, sometimes a friend, an activist and a researcher, I encountered an increasing number of people with a refugee background, who were navigating racism, asylum and deportability. These people were mostly from Somalia (**Article II**) and Iraq (Marucco, 2017; **Article III**).

I should emphasise that I did not befriend people in order to collect data. On a few occasions, I obtained research data from people I regarded as friends. Not only friendships, but also many of my contacts, various forms of ally relationships and relationships of care were established or grew during this research, both through activism and other dimensions of our everyday life. I have always reflected on these processes and subjectivities and continue to do so. I see them as part of an overlap, blurring and sometimes co-constitutiveness of me as a researcher, an activist and, primarily, a human among humans. I critically analyse my subjectivities in some of these processes in Article III and in the methodology chapter of this thesis (especially in the subsection 3.2.).

These initial emergent encounters (Fuller and Askins, 2010: 665) taught me much of what I know about the temporalities and agencies of different people with a refugee background. Many of these people had needs that, in my situated view, academic research alone could not always meet; this view possibly depends on my own path as a doctoral researcher, e.g. on the fact that I designed the research agenda on my own and that, partly, I focused on different themes from those prioritised by many of the people that I encountered.

During the first year of my PhD, in 2015-2016, I spent months reading about research ethics, e.g. the guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity, the *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies* by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (2012)[3], and also Rastas (2004, 2013). However, I felt this ethics learning process was boosted by my fieldwork and by getting to know various people with a refugee background

---

[3] In 2022, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies issued their *Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research* (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2022), which supersedes and substitutes the Institute's *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies* (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012). These guidelines were introduced to me by Professor Zsuzsanna Millei during the research workshop "*Methodologies for the Liminal, the Excluded, and the Mobile*", organised by the research group RELATE CoE in October 2015 at the University of Tampere.

(**Article II**). One crucial event was in summer 2016, when a group of people I had met during the fieldwork for Article II contacted me as they were organising actions against racism in their neighbourhood. At that time, there had been discussions at the municipal level about the possibility that some newly arrived asylum seekers would be lodged in their neighbourhood; this discussion was met, among other things, by local reactions – from within and beyond the neighbourhood – characterised by hostility and racism towards the possible new residents. In addition, the racialised people living in this neighbourhood, who had contacted me, were being conflated with "refugees" and they reported experiencing increasingly frequent and violent racist attacks. They asked me if, thanks to my work as a researcher, I knew people in relevant positions who could effectively support their initiative.

Helping to organise with them – both local residents and members of NGOs – taught me a great deal of what I have learned so far about acting together, advocating, respecting agency and space and being an ally in anti-racist initiatives. Additionally, through this experience, I understood that I wanted to do research on themes that people could use in similar cases, to contribute to enabling and sustaining political communication across society and various positions (Young, 1999).

In late 2016, I had growing contacts with various people arriving in Finland as asylum seekers, which significantly contributed to improving my understanding of the ethical, methodological and political implications of doing research about the lives of people who were, among many other things, racialised and deportable (**Article III**). In addition, my encounters with activists and activist researchers were crucial in helping me find my research approach and re-orientate my research towards issues that were more relevant to the lives of people with a refugee background: these encounters included getting to know people from the We See You campaign and association and from then newly established Every Woman's Centre (n.d.; n.d.), as well as researchers such as Anitta Kynsilehto and Leonardo Custódio (see respectively Penttinen and Kynsilehto, 2017; Activist Research Network, n.d., and Sartoretto and Custódio, 2020). Throughout the thesis, the support of activist scholar Eveliina Lyytinen, one of my supervisors, was essential, too.

In the context of asylum in Finland, in the period after 2015 funders gave more support to studies about refugees and refugeehood. Many researchers – some of whom had no experience or previous scientific, societal or personal engagement in these issues – undertook to study a range of related topics. Some funders also demanded that the research be published quickly and that it should be impactful, policy-relevant research, without necessarily thinking through how policies would impact the lives of people seeking protection.

Over the past years in Finland, many universities have been increasingly under-resourced and adopting neoliberal logics of commercialisation, profiling and competition for research funding (Refstie, 2021: 163). In the current Finnish

academia, as in other countries, performance management and the number of academic publications have gained an increasingly important role in advancing careers and in securing funding for university departments (Kallio, Kallio and Grossi, 2017)[4]. The ensuing speeding temporalities and the emphasis on "papers" as publications – compared to other academic activities like teaching for example – *colonise* the time of many researchers across various career stages (Refstie, 2021: 166), including the time of doctoral candidates. In principle, doctoral training in Finland is envisaged as being completed in four years, during which candidates are expected to master methodological and ethical skills, carry out fieldwork, write and publish from two to four refereed articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals, write a thesis introduction and defend their thesis – sometimes without any systematic training and adequate funding (**Article III**). Altogether, these processes thwart one of the key missions of universities: to challenge dominant ways of thinking and acting and thereby to expand the sphere of democracy for the benefit of broader audiences (Refstie, 2021: 163).

In the delicate context of asylum and of growing undocumentedness in Finland, some researchers and geographers would turn to studying marginalised people and places, to access spaces intended to support people navigating asylum and deportability and to make use of participatory approaches and methods – including volunteering (Refstie, 2021: 165). However, it is unclear how often these approaches were used in their full critical and radical potential, whether they served the agendas of people in marginalised positions, acted for their justice and did not simply advance the researchers' academic careers (Staeheli and Lawson, 1995: 335); similarly, some geographers and other scholars failed to reflect critically on their own positionalities and on the power dynamics involved in their researches and methodologies (Refstie, 2021: ibid..).

Activists and workers from NGOs and other communities – be they refugees themselves, researchers, or others – would receive from researchers who had no previous ties to these NGOs and communities and whose contribution to the communities' actual needs was sometimes unclear requests for informants, interviews, time and space for data collection. In contrast, many of these communities in the field of asylum and deportations would struggle to gain any sizeable support among the general population and found it difficult to mobilise people for their causes.

---

[4] For a critical reflection on performance management beyond the Finnish context, see for example Manes-Rossi, Mussari and Cepiku, 2022. To read more about the possible implications of performance management and of the marketisation of academic work, as well as about the possibilities of ethical research publications, see among others Madikizela-Madiya, 2023. Concerning the risks related to the ʻcorporate universityʼ for employeesʼ well-being, quality and freedom of science, and research ethics, see for instance Järvenpää *et al.*, 2021.

The second turn in my research path occurred in 2016-2017, when I became part of URMI, a research project and team researching a range of issues around people arriving in Finland as asylum seekers in 2015, among other themes. As a project researcher, I thus had to start working on a different topic than the one I was initially investigating in my own doctoral research. From my topic of lived citizenship amongst Somali people, the autumn of 2016 saw my topic shift to the everyday lives, spaces and practices of people arrived as asylum seekers in 2015. A little later, in the spring of 2017, as part of the same project, I researched the spaces and practices of leisure time among Finnish Somalis and the spectrum of links between leisure, at one end, and segregation and integration, on the other. I stayed in the URMI project for one year. At that point, the theme of time was somehow part of my research as it emerged from my empirical data and analysis; however, my theoretical and analytical focus was on space and did not engage with temporalities.

Simultaneously, as my personal contacts with people navigating asylum and deportability increased, temporalities became increasingly visible and significant in my everyday life, too. This culminated in the summer 2017, when I started volunteering as lay assistant in asylum and residence permit cases, thanks to the training given by the local project Every Woman's Centre, a project supporting women and others living in undocumentedness or at risk of becoming undocumented (**Article III**).

As a result of these various encounters, I approached my research in new ways. This meant, between 2017 and 2019, that I endeavoured to put "life before the paper", thus prioritising the practices that people with a refugee background needed and enacted themselves; in particular, I participated in political activism, lay legal assistance and everyday care with people navigating asylum, permits, undocumentedness and deportability (**Article III**). In the following years, also due to discontinuous funding, I worked as a community mediator – a job partly related to the topics of my research and activism and to my overall methodological approach. Moreover, I strove to make my research more relevant to the priorities of people navigating asylum and deportability and to conceptualise what I had been learning by living and doing things together with some of them.

What has remained the same throughout the research process is the approach which is based on social, critical and feminist geographies. My interest has always been on everyday life in its multiple dimensions: on people's agencies and subjectivities, the meanings that people attach to and the ways they experience citizenship, asylum and leisure; on the interplay between their individual and collective experiences and the temporal structures of citizenship (**Article II**), asylum (**Article III**) and leisure (**Article I**).

Bringing this all together in this synopsis has advanced my thinking and practice. However, simultaneously, it has demanded its own time, space and resources to

bridge the three empirically different papers in a way that would be consistent with the data and the research process as well as being respectful of the agencies of people with a refugee background, and, also allowing the thesis to be in conversation with the relevant scientific literature.

1.3.2 Finnish Somalis and Iraqis with a refugee background in Finland

In this thesis, I refer to one of the many subjectivities of the people I have encountered during my work and for whom I have done this research. I focus on their subjectivity as "people with a refugee background" to examine their agencies as "migrants whose presence on state territory is somehow contested and/or legally precarious" (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 2). I see "refugeehood" not just as legal status and as the official recognition of the need for international protection, but also as a broad concept embracing processes and experiences of forced, unprivileged mobilities (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvii), mobilities which are made unsafe by global, supranational and national passport and migration regimes (**Article II**). Without intending to victimise and homogenise the various individuals behind the label of people who have experienced or are experiencing refugeehood, I focus on the agencies of migrants who are often represented as unwelcome in certain national and broader contexts (Vuolteenaho and Lyytinen, 2018: 122), and classified as alien and deportable (De Genova, 2002).

My research initially focused on Finnish Somalis because, through my everyday experiences, I noticed that discourses at various scales in Finland tend to other and marginalise them in various ways. For example, Finnish Somalis have been found to be one of the most discriminated minorities in Europe (FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017: 29; Rask *et al.*, 2018: 902). After changing my research plan in relation with my work in the URMI project and then through various encounters and activism, I expanded my focus to people with a refugee background in general. In research and in activism, given my emergent access and position in the networks of people navigating asylum and deportability, I focused especially on men arriving in Finland from Iraq – although I also had significant contacts with people of various genders from other countries, e.g. Afghanistan and Somalia.

I am aware that my focus on people as "Somalis" and "Iraqis" can be ethically and methodologically problematic, e.g. it just engages one dimension of their identities, adopts an ethnic and national lens and risks homogenising and essentialising their agencies. I have striven to address these problems by engaging with the research participants and others in similar positions as a human being, not only as a researcher or activist; also, I have made efforts to show in my texts the

multiplicity of subjectivities and diversity existing among people from Somalia and Iraq and, more generally, among people with a refugee background.

In the global context at the time of conducting this research, the mobilities of people from Somalia, Iraq and Afghanistan were mostly underprivileged – as those of the people of many other countries across the globe. The passports they were assigned at birth are currently placed at the bottom of the global hierarchies of passports in an unequal citizenship market (**Article II**:116; Kallio and Mitchell, 2016: 260). These people usually face the denial of legal avenues and safe routes to their desired destinations, for example to the EU.

Having said this, one should be careful to avoid talking about people with a refugee background and people on the move – in Finland, in the EU and globally – as if they could be grouped under one and the same label or as if they shared meaningful commonalities rooted in their mobilities. Mostly, they do not. They are people with different genders, ages, dis/abilities, resources to move, migration stories, solidarities, political views, power positions – in their home context, in their journeys and in the EU over time (**Article I**: 92; **Article II**: 114).

2   Theoretical Framework and Key Concepts

The theoretical framework for this thesis focuses on political processes of production of subjectivities for people with a refugee background, thus drawing on interdisciplinary studies about temporalities and migrant mundane agencies. I understand subjectivities as ways of being produced, making oneself, being in the world, knowing and acting (**Article II**: 111, 119; Dickinson *et al.*, 2008; Kynsilehto, 2011a; Staeheli *et al.*, 2012).

In the following, I introduce the concepts of temporalities and locate my approach to agencies in the literature. Subsequently, I critically address national linear temporalities of immigration and integration by giving an overview of the temporalities usually associated with refugeehood and citizenship. Further, I propose the viewpoint of a spatio-temporal continuum to conceptualise the simultaneous, non-linear and multiple temporalities of people with a refugee background. Lastly, I introduce segregation as a spatial, temporal and methodological concept.

For a long time, geographers have been discussing time and temporality in relation to various topics (Ho, 2021: 1668), the common themes being cities (Crang, 2003; Kitchin, 2019; Mulíček, Osman and Seidenglanz, 2016; Wood, 2015) and capitalism and labour (Axelsson, Malmberg and Zhang, 2017; Hughes, 2021; Thrift, 1981). Regarding the topics of this thesis more specifically, geographers have increasingly been examining various forms of migration (Collins, 2021; Gawlewicz and Sotkasiira, 2020; Jacobsen, 2022; Mitchell, 2023; Page, Christou and Mavroudi, 2017; Tefera and Gamlen, 2023; Watkins, 2020).

The geographical literature on asylum, refugeehood and temporalities has often been concerned with camps and detention centres (Mountz, 2011; Papoutsi, 2021; Ramadan, 2013; Weima and Minca, 2022), legal geographies and feminist geo-legal analyses (Gill *et al.*, 2022; Jacobsen, 2022). In my research, I am particularly interested in the idea of temporality as lived experience of time, embedded in power relations and related to the production, transformation and negotiation of subjectivities (Feldman, 2016; Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021; Meier, 2020; Meier and Donà, 2021; Pascucci, 2016; Thorshaug and Brun, 2019). To put it simply,

temporalities can be understood as the condition of existing within or having a relationship with time.

Following Robertson (2014: 1918) and Kallio, Meier and Häkli (2021: 4–5), I use the term "time" to refer to quantitative, objective and chronological time – for example, the years spent by a person living in Finland waiting for asylum, or the continuous period of residence required for applying for Finnish citizenship. In contrast, I use the word "temporality" to signify embodied, lived experiences of time (ibid.: 5) – for example, an asylum seeker's decision to focus on the present by taking care of themselves and their family, and/or to create alternative futures by volunteering, studying or working.

The structural conditions and human experiences of time, as well as the everyday practices that come to constitute time, "produce social and emotional states" (Ho, 2021: 1668). My focus is particularly on the dimensions of temporalities as lived, embodied experiences of time at the intersection of structures and agencies at multiple scales (**Article II**).

This thesis builds on scholarly works about waiting (Mountz, 2011; Torres *et al.*, 2022), with a view to expand and complicate the understandings of migrant temporalities also beyond the concept of waiting (Drangsland, 2021). Thus, I see waiting as just one possible dimension of migrant temporalities throughout refugeehood and citizenship. Indeed, the focus in this thesis is more on individual agencies and on the implications of global migration regimes and nations states for the subjectivities and lives of people with a refugee background, in their everyday life, in their "here and now", and over time.

Temporalities are at stake in the various modes of governing migration on different scales; also, complex temporalities shape migration experiences and practices (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 1). In different contexts, time takes on a crucial role in the processes of illegalisation or irregularisation (ibid.: 2).

An important concept is that of temporal heterogeneity, which, in the context of this thesis, implies "an understanding of people as immersed in multiple and co-constitutive temporalities" (Drangsland, 2021: 77). Temporalities are increasingly understood as being multiple, relational, uneven and entangled (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 7), as well as intersecting and multi-scalar (**Article II**; **Article III**). Various scales also exist among the web of actors governing the time of people with a refugee background: this web includes states and their representatives within and beyond the national borders, supranational states and corporations, who operate on co-existing and intersecting micro, meso and macro scales (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvi). Such are the scales of global mobilities and national migration regimes, and the scale of the embodied, everyday 'microlevel'. Individuals move between various scales of temporal production and perception: every person is embedded in

multiple intersecting temporalities simultaneously and can be positioned differently in each temporality (**Article II**; Scheller, 2019: 337).

2.1   Between structures and agencies

I approach people with a refugee background and research participants as "subjects in their own structured agency, their own intersubjective practices and in the sets of relationships they negotiate every day with various communities within or beyond the territorial boundaries of the state" (**Article II**: 111). In other words, I focus on temporalities and subjectivities to better understand "the relations of power at play where structural constraints meet migrants' everyday practices" (Fontanari, 2017: 28).

To keep someone waiting is an exercise of power over their time (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xix). Global, supranational and national mobility regimes shape the time of people with a refugee background, thus producing time-spaces and experiences of waiting (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 10). In addition, the temporal structures related to refugeehood and irregular migration are produced by cultural norms, power relationships, local encounters, and by the various agencies, navigations, compliances and resistances of people with a refugee background (ibid.: 3).

It is important to note that time can assume various meanings: here I approach it as the time that global and national migration regimes *steal* from certain people whose mobilities these regimes disenfranchise – a process which is *active, deliberate and inherently harmful* (Khosravi, 2019; Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvii) – and as the time that people with a refugee background reclaim, recreate, invest or spend. Immigration regimes and the variety of actors and individuals enacting them can take, give, control or influence time (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: ibid.).

Despite the pervasive nature and power of time as mobilised by the state, the agencies of people with a refugee background and of all the people navigating migration regimes must not be downplayed. These agencies are more than just restricted, shaped and influenced by the time of states and migration regimes. They are a myriad of different experiences, emotions and practices. Focusing on the agencies of people with a refugee background is important in order to bear witness to their lives and varied humanity, to recognise existing and new spaces of resistance and solidarity (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xviii), to amplify their priorities and voices and to mobilise as many people as possible to support migratory justice.

I explore the spatio-temporalities of people with a refugee background from the point of view of their mundane agency. In **Article II**, where I delve more deeply into theorising, I articulate mundane agency by using the concepts of political agency and lived citizenship. Briefly put, I approach agencies as less civic or not intentionally

civic ways of enacting agency. The agencies I focus on encompass private, intimate, local, national, transnational and global spaces and scales (Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1547). They may be 'at the limit of the political', also for the very people enacting them (**Article II**: 111). This approach allows the recognition of the details and peculiarity of the lives of people with a refugee background. Furthermore, they help unravel essentialist views of time, refugeehood and citizenship (Cwerner, 2001: 15). I also examine my own agency in relation to asylum and its spatio-temporalities, by employing autoethnography and critical reflexivity (see further about methodology, subsection 3.1.).

I think about agency in relational ways – thus recognising how I am embedded in the phenomena that I have studied in this thesis as a researcher, a human being and an activist. Such an approach, I argue, has implications for how geography can be theorised (and practised) and for the purposes of research (**Article III**). Thus, I claim that what I present here as the theoretical framework of this thesis has to do with my agency as a researcher and with all researchers' agencies, too. I explore this dimension of the researcher's agency in more detail in the methodological chapter (subsection 3.2.).

2.2   A critique of linear temporalities

In general, there is a tendency in policies, various publics and other spaces to narrate refugeehood following a "one-directional temporal logic", thus telling a story that starts with exile, when a person leaves their known or assumed country of origin or of previous residence (hence "the attributed country of origin", Laakkonen, 2022), and comes to a resolution and closure when the person is re-inserted into a framework of national identification (Drangsland, 2021: 80; on a critique of linear temporalities, see also Fontanari, 2017). According to these stories, the temporalities of people with a refugee background follow linear trajectories and culminate in acquiring the citizenship of the country of asylum or of new residence (Lyytinen, 2019; Meier and Donà, 2021: 43). Accordingly, immigration policies and residence permit systems are built on the same "presumption of linearity" (Könönen, 2018: 58).

Linear temporalities are connected with methodological nationalism, which they contribute to reproducing (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). In addition, they are permeated with coloniality: "[T]hinking about colonial others as 'waiting' to arrive in a future forged in the imaginary of the European nation-state carries racialised and essentialising normative assumptions" (Drangsland, 2021: 85). Even a quick glance at the routes and attributed countries of origin makes manifest the fact that the mobilities of people with a refugee background, many of whom various state representatives abuse and kill as they try to cross borders, are "intimately linked with

the history and patterns of colonialism … As the encounter with a world outside Global North was in the beginning, so it is now in part motivated by a sense of racial and colonial superiority" (Laakkonen, 2022).

Moreover, such linear temporal assumptions overlook the refugees' temporal agencies and the existing organic connections between their past, presents and futures (Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021: 5). As Khosravi writes, "[t]he future is not a section of a linear timeline, which will come after the present, but rather is in a constant dialectical relation with the present" (Khosravi, 2021: 206). In other words, there is "a constant interplay between the now and the not-yet" (ibid.).

Questions regarding how people living through refugeehood conceptualise and experience their own trajectories, when they start creating their futures and what they do with their past are hardly ever asked. Moreover, only a fragment of those researching and theorising on the temporalities of refugeehood have ever navigated refugeehood themselves, directly or indirectly. There is a body of research and popular texts which bear witness to how people may find or make home, participate, pursue their own priorities well before being granted asylum or another kind of residence permit; likewise, their spatio-temporal agency may be restricted even after accessing the realm of formal citizenship in their country of asylum or new residence (Ambrosini, 2012: 14; **Article II**).

One corollary of these non-linear temporalities is that people on the move cannot be seen as completely excluded or included: this becomes even more visible over time, by attending to their own experiences and priorities (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 11). Therefore, as I will show in the discussion chapter, subjectivities, practices and experiences of inclusions, exclusion and participation can be blurred, intermittent, simultaneous, both in different and in the same dimensions of their everyday life, e.g. family, employment, leisure, and so on.

2.2.1   Temporalities of refugeehood and citizenship

The temporalities of refugeehood are often associated with: immigration detention, deportation and the fear of these (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvii); with waiting, immobility, slowness (Drangsland, 2021: 87); with asylum processes, camps and reception centres (Hyndman and Giles, 2011; Mountz, 2011; Papoutsi, 2021; Thorshaug and Brun, 2019); with a sense of being pushed back in time, of being sent "back to square one" (Khosravi, 2021: 203; **Article II**: 109, 110). Refugeehood can be seen as sharing similarities with "border waiting", lack of mobility and of time and space (Khosravi, 2021: 206). Despite such restricted mobilities and spatio-temporal agencies, refugeehood should not be seen as "a static condition", but rather as "a process and a practice" (ibid.). Similarly, an increasing number of analyses

have been encouraging researchers to move beyond waiting as a passive experience (Näre, Bendixsen and Maury, 2022: 4).

Refugeehood can also be experienced by various people as the position of one's "normal life-course" being constantly delayed by temporal violence (Khosravi, 2021: 204). This violence can take the form of accelerations or stalemates, which people with a refugee background often experience as exceptional, not ordinary (Meier and Donà, 2021: 46). The time of people with a refugee background can be produced as "slow and monotonous, with days, weeks and even years passing in a sense of stuckness, waiting for papers or family reunifications … indefinite immigration detention", or, alternatively, it may be compressed and frenzied by dispersal, relocation or the announcement of deportation (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvi; **Article III**).

There are several studies about the spaces and spatialities of citizenship (for example, Painter and Philo, 1995 and Pascucci, 2016); however, there are fewer works that explore citizenship through a temporal lens (**Article II**: 107; Esposito *et al.*, 2020; Rodrigo, 2021). I see the institutional temporalities of citizenship as unfolding through integration programmes and citizenship application processes (**Article II**: 109). Citizenship laws, norms and perceptions privilege some individuals and marginalise others based on how citizenship laws, norms and perceptions intersect with their gender, race, class, and other positions (**Article II**: 111; Painter and Philo, 1995: 116). Consequently, tensions are often sparked between citizenship as legal status and as lived experience, causing a decoupling of citizenship rights and status (**Article II**: ibid.; Leitner and Ehrkamp, 2006: 1617).

2.2.2   The refugeehood-citizenship continuum

To challenge linear temporalities of refugeehood and citizenship, I propose to conceptualise citizenship and refugeehood as the co-constitutive extremes of a spatio-temporal continuum along which people may shift in different directions, become blocked, and appear simultaneously at different points of the continuum in relation to different dimensions of their everyday life (**Article II**).

This conceptualisation is based on the idea that refugeehood "as a legal, social and political framework is central to inquiries into citizenship" (**Article II**: 109), and that the production of the subjectivities of people with a refugee background is deeply interwoven with the production of citizenship (Kapur, 2007: 539). This said, I do not mean that refugeehood would be the only concept in relation with which citizenship is shaped and which, in turn, is shaped by citizenship. From other perspectives, it is possible to interrogate the mutually constitutive relations between citizenship, at one end, and different categories such as statelessness or irregular migration, at the other. My argument is the following: highlighting how refugeehood

and citizenship are mutually constitutive is a key to exposing the nativist, racialised privilege that legal citizenship enjoys in Finland, in the EU as in other contexts.

I hope that conceptualising refugeehood and citizenship as a continuum also diminishes the risks of reproducing people with a refugee background as others when critically addressing the temporalities that strive to govern their lives (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 4). Indeed, as researchers, humans and activists, we must be careful not to deny the coevalness – i.e. the fact of co-existing in time – of refugees with people with no refugee background by overlooking the various ways in which all these people share certain temporal rhythms (ibid.: 5). This also means challenging the assumption that native and "new" residents and citizens may enjoy an ordinary, secure and stable life (ibid.).

Considering this, there is a specific need to also attend to the experiences of people with a refugee background specifically. Indeed, unlike in the lives of many others, the time and temporalities of people with a refugee background are "regularly governed by policy, law and legislation, by militarised interference and patrols at national and international borders", "bureaucratised in the every day [sic] through surveillant forms of governance which require migrants to 'prove' their right to move across borders or stay within borders" (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvi), and their right to occupy and make a home in certain spaces. Borders do not end when a person crosses the "hard outside borders" (Könönen, 2018: 54): orders become attached to the bodies of some people, they "follow migrants into the national space through legal status and transform the 'soft inside' into a range of restrictions and impediments" (ibid.: 55).

Attempting to divert these risks when studying the temporalities of people with a refugee background means to carefully avoid reproducing naturalised assumptions about the nation state, too (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 5). This is one further reason why seeing refugeehood and citizenship as being co-constitutive helps understand that everybody, in any position, including researchers and activists, are embedded and partake in the production of subjectivities of people with a refugee background, as I will show in the methodological chapter and in the discussion when exploring the segregation of subjectivities among some researchers (see further sections 3.2. and 4.3.).

2.3   Segregation: spatial, political and methodological

I understand segregation in three main ways: spatial, political and methodological. As to spatial segregation, I see it as people using separate physical and social spaces in their everyday practices, such as while working, studying, spending their leisure time. I stress the mutual nature of spatial segregation and question why segregation

is often discussed in relation to racialised people, while whiteness and white segregation[5] are normalised, made invisible and overlooked. White segregation is hardly considered a problem, but it relates to the segregation of ethnic and racial minorities (**Article I**: 91; Bolt, Özüekren and Phillips, 2010: 174).

This thesis raises questions about why, how, and for whom segregation is a problem, i.e. segregation as a political issue. I approach this question by drawing on Iris Marion Young's work, where she argues that the problem with segregation is not much "group clustering", but how "the everyday separation of the lives of the more and less privileged … makes it unnecessary for the privileged to think about social injustice except in the most abstract terms" (Young, 1999: 242; **Article III**). Thus, segregation is problematic in that it reproduces inequality and thwarts the political communication necessary to make things fairer.

In my work, I apply Young's reasoning about racial residential segregation to global and national migration regimes. In this thesis, I understand political segregation as the processes through which the state produces discrete subjectivities for people with a refugee background – and the processes through which other people may comply with and contribute to such segregating processes. In other words, I use the idea of political segregation to investigate what roles are available for those people with a refugee background who have survived crossing external state borders into Europe and Finland. These processes of segregation are similar to what Mountz called "the seclusion of identities" (Mountz, 2011: 386); they are produced by the global migration regimes and national linear temporalities of integration (**Article II**). These segregation processes have concrete spatial and temporal implications for the agencies of people with a refugee background.

Last but not least, in this thesis I address what I call methodological segregation, meaning the tendency among some geographers and other scholars to think of themselves as researchers while overlooking their other positionalities in relation to the phenomena they study and their embeddedness in them. I understand subjectivities as grounding our understanding of who we are, where our knowledge comes from and to where it is directed (Gregory *et al.*, 2009: 728; **Article II**: 119). I build on this understanding in order to reflect on how methodological segregation manifests itself spatially and temporally and how it has epistemological, practical and political consequences. I start from the point that immigration systems highlight certain identities and neglect others (Raghuram, 2021: 11) – which I understand as a process of dissecting and segregating the complexity of human subjectivities –, to interrogate the production of subjectivities among researchers and, thus, in my own research path (**Article III**).

---

[5]   By "white segregation", I refer to the "clustering of white people", the "overwhelming whiteness" of certain residential areas, job places and professions, educational institutions and study fields (Phillips, 2006: 29).

I concentrate on methodological segregation in part of the methodological chapter and of the discussion. First, in the section 3.2., I combine views on activism, advocacy and care from critical and feminist geographies, at one end, and from forced-migration research, at the other, to explore how activism – broadly understood –, research and humanity can be practised reflexively (**Article III**). Then, in the discussion chapter (4.3.), I explore the question of how the separation of some geographers' subjectivities as researchers, humans, activists or other may resemble the production of segregated migrant subjectivities enacted by national immigration regimes.

3   Methodology

3.1   Research materials and methods for each article

	Article I	**Article II**	**Article III**
Methods of data collection	• preliminary phone interviews • informal interviews • group thematic semi-structured interviews • one-to-one thematic semi-structured interviews = *87 people interviewed* • participant observation	• 7 one-to-one thematic semi-structured interviews • 2 group thematic semi-structured interviews = *15 people interviewed* • participant observation • follow-up e-mails/messages	Autoethnography
Period of data collection, frequency and time of the day	• 2.2017–9.2017 • ~3 days/week • morning, afternoon, evening	• 3.2016–7.2016 • 1–2 days/week • 2019-2020 (follow-up messages)	(I did not collect data while doing activism. I autoethnographically analysed the activism and research I conducted in 2016–2019)
Methods of data analysis	• coding in NVivo software • qualitative content and thematic analysis • discussing my interpretations with some participants	• coding in NVivo software • qualitative content and thematic analysis • discussing my interpretations with some participants	Discussing my interpretations with some fellow activists, activist researchers, people with a refugee background and deportable people

3.1.1   Article I

To start mapping leisure activities and spaces in Turku, in February 2017, I conducted phone interviews with various people working for the City of Turku and some from local libraries. I selected three districts in Turku with many Somali residents, so that I could collect data from a relatively large number of research

participants and preserve their anonymity. In order to protect their anonymity, in Article I pseudonyms are used for the districts. Subsequently, between March and September 2017, I conducted fieldwork for about three days a week in the three districts and in the centre of the city. I collected data using participant observation, informal interviews (Fetterman, 2009), one-to-one semi-structured thematic interviews and group semi-structured thematic interviews. The fieldwork languages were Finnish and, to a lesser extent, English – I had studied Finnish between 2011 and 2016, gradually gaining working proficiency in this language. I conducted this fieldwork as part of the URMI project; a research assistant from the project collected part of the fieldwork data using participant observation and informal interviews.

At this point in my doctoral research, I had established networks thanks to my previous fieldwork (**Article II**) and engagement with some local residents organising actions against racist attacks (summer 2016). Therefore, I found research participants through my existing networks, by visiting leisure spaces used by some Somali people, and asking the people I met if they could suggest more participants. The participants consisted mostly of Finnish Somalis, but also of residents, site users and gatekeepers of other ethnicities; by "gatekeepers", I mean people working in NGOs and in youth centres. To learn about various leisure practices and encounter people who may not spend leisure time far from their homes, the spaces of the fieldwork included courtyards in residential areas, shopping centres, libraries, the premises of some associations, sports venues, the homes of some research participants and cafés.

I carried out participant observation about three days a week for a few hours each time, at different times of the day and on different days including weekends. In practice, I visited and walked around the leisure places that I had identified, such as courtyards, playgrounds, local libraries, youth homes, organisations, walking paths and nearby outdoor areas, shopping centres, shops and cafés. I recorded my observations on a voice recorder and wrote them down in a notebook – for more details about how I transcribed my observations, please see the section on research ethics, 3.1.2.. The notes contained information about the place and time of the observation, the people I met or saw, what they did, and my thoughts and questions about these observations.

In connection with participant observation, I talked to as many people as possible and made informal interviews. During each informal interview, I asked the research participant about their leisure patterns (e.g. how they understand leisure, what they do during their leisure time, where, with whom) and the leisure patterns of other people in the district where the interview was being held. If the participant agreed to share more data with me, I then asked for some background information, e.g. the participant's position in the life cycle, their ethnicity and their migration and/or residence history. Such informal interviews lasted from three to thirty minutes. However, with gatekeepers, I held lightly structured interviews instead. After each

interview, I recorded my anonymised observations using an audio recorder or wrote down some anonymised notes in a notebook.

Avoiding ethnic profiling was paramount in this study (Keskinen *et al.*, 2018). Thus, through informal interviews, I talked with people of various ethnic backgrounds; I strove not to assume people's ethnicity and I followed their own definitions. I used the data from people of other ethnicities than Somali as background information to build my understanding of leisure in the three districts and to contextualise the data provided by the Finnish Somali research participants. Altogether, I held interviews with eighty-seven people of various ethnicities, ages and genders. Of these eighty-seven participants, seventy-one were interviewed as residents of the districts or of Turku and sixteen were interviewed as gatekeepers (**Article I**: 92–93).

I coded the materials in NVivo software and I examined them through content and thematic analysis. In practice, I read the observation and interview notes and coded the text based on the research questions, the topics of the interviews and other important or recurring issues raised by the research participants or otherwise emerging from the fieldwork. I identified both prevalent, similar and unique themes and I observed the relationships between them. I examined possible relationships between the themes and the participants' positions, in particular gender, but also race, class, age, time of migration, marital and parental status. Gender is a crucial dimension in studies on leisure and power structures (te Kloeze, 2001: 53); also, gender had a prominent role in the data. Thus, I organised the themes and my writing mainly around gender.

3.1.2 Article II

Initially, my plan was to collect data with Somali people of all genders. Therefore, during that period, I conducted participant observation also with Finnish Somali men. Although some of them were eager to support me with the research and shared precious information during my participant observation, with time, it proved easier to recruit interviewees among Finnish Somali women, possibly thanks to our shared gender and the support of gatekeepers from organisations. The decision to base Article II solely on the data from women came later, when I entered the URMI project and had to devote my time to the topics relevant to the project. Nevertheless, even after deciding to focus on women's data, I continued visiting everyday spaces where I could also encounter some Somali men, with a view to maintaining the trust and relationships that I had previously established.

Between March and July 2016, I conducted fieldwork in Turku, interviewing and spending time with Finnish Somali women of various ages more or less weekly. I conducted one-to-one and group semi-structured thematic interviews and spent a

considerable amount of time doing participant observation to attempt to understand the daily interplay between the participants' political agencies and their social, economic and legal frameworks (Lister, 2007). At that time, I had had no previous contact with Finnish Somalis, so I contacted some associations engaged with Somali culture, Islam, womanhood and multiculturalism, who kindly helped me meet and recruit participants, mostly through snowball sampling.

Participant observation constituted a major part of my data collection. I conducted participant observation to build and consolidate mutual trust with the women and to improve my understanding of their lived citizenship, subjectivities and priorities: in practice, during March and July 2016, for on average one to two days a week, I would just spend time – from twenty minutes to a few hours – with several interviewees and with other Finnish Somalis, for example by walking together, sitting and chatting, or by participating in social events like *Eid* celebrations and leisure activities for women and girls. Mostly, the women and I communicated in Finnish, a language that both I and several research participants were then learning; we were proficient enough to have the interviews, to talk about what the participants considered important, and to talk and do things together (cooking, eating, dancing, …) during participant observation.

I handwrote anonymised notes in my notebook after each participant observation. In the notes, I recounted as accurately as I could what happened, where we met, what we discussed, and my feelings, interpretations and further questions to reflect on in the research. This observation data provided me with important background knowledge; also, as many participants had busy schedules and would share some things they consider important only after the interview, being with them through participant observation allowed me to gather more data and increased the coherence of my analysis.

In addition to participant observation, I conducted semi-structured thematic interviews with altogether fifteen Finnish Somali women: I interviewed seven of them individually and eight in two separate groups. The interview themes concerned the women's identity narratives, their definitions of citizenship, their everyday routines and any other priority they wished to share.

Initially, when I asked them if they would like to participate in the research, I would issue each potential interviewee with an informed consent form, explain what I meant by asking their consent to the interview and request them to sign. After a few attempts, it became clear to me that several of the Finnish Somali women I met felt uneasy with such formal academic procedures. At times, I felt our mutual trust could be weakened by this way of asking consent, possibly because some potential research participants did not understand the procedure, or it could evoke unpleasant memories from their asylum or residence permit processes. By discussing this question with my supervisor and with some Finnish Somalis, I realised that some

people were unfamiliar with academic research or had lived negative experiences with researchers. A Somali gatekeeper suggested that I avoid presenting people with texts and communicating with long e-mails, and that I rather opt for talking and asking oral consent as a general strategy. Therefore, from time to time, I would ask written or oral consent, mostly opting for the oral one, translating the formal academic language into an everyday, more relatable one. I did not record the given oral consent or the interviews any time the interviewee did not feel comfortable with it.

In agreement with each interviewee, we held the interviews in the venues of the various associations and projects that had helped me recruit the participants. Hoping to make the interview setting less formal and daunting for the interviewees, I offered something to drink and to eat. The interviews had various durations, roughly between half an hour and one hour each, depending on the schedule of the interviewee and on how much they wanted to talk. We held all the interviews in Finnish, except for two interviews which we held in English. In one of the two group interviews, we were helped by a trusted Finnish-Somali interpreter suggested by some of the group interviewees.

Like in the process of asking consent about participating in the research, I understood some interviewees felt uncomfortable if I then asked if I could record the interview with an audio recorder. Thus, I decided to ask about the possibility to record the interview only when the interviewee seemed as much as possible at ease with the interview setting, and I recorded it solely when the interviewee expressly and convincedly agreed to the recording. If I did not record the interview, during the interview I would take hand-written notes of the key points; then, once I was alone immediately after the interview, I expanded the notes with all I recalled. For those interviews that I was allowed to record, I anonymised them by removing the interviewees' names and other identifiers. I transcribed the interviews using a computer. I offered the interviewees their transcriptions and asked if they wished to keep a copy of the transcription or to correct anything in it; I felt this helped enhance transparency and trust, whether the interviewees asked the transcription or not – only one or two interviewees did.

Due to my points of access to the field, the data has some limitations: at the time of the fieldwork, most of the Finnish Somali women I interacted with were mothers, were navigating the integration process, were learning Finnish and we did not share any other language (see later subsection 4.1.3.). In 2019–2020, while writing this article after other research projects, I turned to two-three gatekeepers via e-mail and messages to clarify some relevant questions that emerged later during my writing – such as, for example, the question of some Finnish Somalis holding an aliens passport being denied online banking credentials. Such gatekeepers were Finnish Somalis working or volunteering in organisations or projects, or otherwise

prominent figures in the Finnish Somali communities. I drew the categories of my analysis both from the data and from the theory. As I did for Article I, I analysed the data using content and thematic analysis with the help of the NVivo coding software (**Article II**: 112–114).

3.1.3   Article III

In this article, I use autoethnography to critically reflect on my experiences of research and activism about asylum in Finland, paying particular attention to temporalities. Through some autoethnographical accounts, I present fragments of my daily experiences between 2016 and 2019 as an ordinary person, a researcher and an activist. Autoethnography has helped me critically address how, during my doctoral process, I have come to embody and practise feminist geography through activism and research around asylum and deportability.

Autoethnography is an increasingly established method in social sciences and in feminist, critical and social geographies (Ali, 2015; Bejarano and Hernández Sánchez, 2023; Butz and Besio, 2009; Horton, 2021; Kinkaid, Parikh and Ranjbar, 2022; Moss and Besio, 2019; Oberhauser and Caretta, 2019; Todd, 2021). It can be understood as the critical representation and examination of one's experiences and emotions in relation to power relations, ideas and practices (Adams and Herrmann, 2023: 3; Alatrash, 2018: 134). Practising autoethnography has helped me delve deeper into the power relations and tensions at play in my intimate, embodied, everyday life. My focus has been on "my own ordinariness, mundaneness, for it is through this invisibility that the subtleties of power express themselves", from being equal, oppressed and/or privileged in different dimensions time after time (Moss, 2001: 3).

By analysing my own experiences, in **Article III** I pursue three main objectives: firstly, I aim at recognising my embeddedness in the research topic. Indeed, considering the co-constitutiveness of refugeehood and citizenship (**Article II**; Kapur, 2007), autoethnography has enabled me to critically analyse my own experiences as a white European citizen, as I have analysed those of people with a refugee background using ethnographic methods (similarly to autobiography: see Moss, 2001: 3). Secondly, I reflect critically on how I and other geographers conceptualise the aims, subjectivities, spatio-temporalities and meanings of geographical and other research, of activism and of everyday life (Datta, 2019: 1106; Maxey, 1999). In this regard, coupled with heightened or political reflexivity, autoethnography has allowed me to unravel how our embodiment as researchers affects our subjectivities, practices and knowledge production in various positions (Abdelnour and Abu Moghli, 2021; Sircar, 2022: 8). Thirdly, I hope that, by illustrating my trajectory as a researcher-and-activist, I can offer some practical

examples and, perhaps, inspiration to fellow PhD candidates. Opening possibilities for identification and empathy (Alatrash, 2018: 134), autobiography can contribute to orientating the author and the readers towards the creation of alternative futures.

Practising autoethnography is an exercise of power which centres the voice of the author, their temporalities, definitions and interpretation. This can raise some ethical and epistemological questions, for example concerning how the production of knowledge and other individuals and communities are represented in autoethnographical accounts (Țîștea, 2020: 38; Wall, 2008, 42; **Article III**). This is the case even though Sircar notices how our research and, possibly, our very presence often has a marginal, fractional place in the life experiences of many participants and other people we may interact with (Sircar, 2022: 17). Therefore, an important element of autoethnographic thinking and writing is critical reflexivity. The challenge for researchers is thus to enact reflexivity not just to acknowledge the power asymmetries, comforts and discomforts embedded in their various positions, but also to actively dismantle them (Vasudevan, 2021: 44).

One possible limitation of my autoethnography may be constituted by the fact that I have relied on my own memories – not on texts I have written or other material that I have produced – when analysing encounters with people navigating deportability, activists and academic in **Article III** (Alatrash, 2018: 134). However, relying on memory is not rare in autoethnography (Wall, 2008: 45). In addition, when writing the encounters, I have documented and reflected on my motivations, agenda and positionality numerous times between 2017 and now. These written analyses have been extended in **Article III** and will continue throughout my work.

3.1.4   Research ethics

When I started my PhD and started meeting Finnish Somali people, I had no existing contacts and very little relevant knowledge. Therefore, when researching the lives of Finnish Somalis, especially before summer 2016, I made broad use of participant observation to build trust with people who had never encountered me before and to learn about contexts and places in Turku that I had not previously come across in my everyday life.

I felt my networks and trust with many Finnish Somalis partly consolidated after summer 2016, when I participated in their organising efforts against racism in a neighbourhood of Turku. Following that, I found a sense of purpose in my research, I felt more legitimate in being present with them in some spaces and found it easier to build trust.

Trust was a crucial issue most probably initially because of my whiteness, my lack of previous contact with any Finnish Somalis and the imbalances created by the researcher-researched relationship (**Article II**: 113). Trust was also an issue because,

for some participants, the interviews and certain conventional procedures of research may have recalled interviews and examinations held by Migri concerning their asylum or residence permit cases (ibid.: 114). Finally, because Finnish Somalis are, like many people with a refugee background, over-researched, and some of them had already had negative experiences with researchers (about over-researching people with a refugee background, see for example Pascucci, 2019).

In 2016 and 2017, as I previously mentioned, I participated in everyday care and activism with people seeking asylum and their supporters as an activist and a fellow human. Therefore, when as part of the URMI project I started researching the everyday lives of Iraqi men who had arrived as asylum seekers (Marucco, 2017), I already had established networks and trust.

Nonetheless, whenever collecting data, I have explicitly clarified my intention and asked consent to collect data from the people present with me in the field and the interviewees. However, from the beginning, it was clear that, if I had to enter the spaces created and used by the various people, I had to do so as a human being, not (just) a researcher. This implied that I humanise my research approach and increasingly consider the agendas of the people with a refugee background that I encountered (Brankamp and Weima, 2021; Leinonen *et al.*, 2020).

While the time I spent together with people navigating deportability in Finland as a fellow human and an activist contributed to a substantial part of my knowledge about refugeehood and asylum and deportations in Finland, it should be emphasised that I did not use that time to actively collect data. I felt people needed to be treated as "just people"; it seemed they did not need someone studying them, even in participatory or humane ways. Similarly, those still waiting for asylum and/or other permits needed "papers", as many of them called the permits, rather than having researchers write academic papers about them (**Article III**).

Therefore, this thesis consists mostly of my own analyses and theorising. I do not think it was a participatory process, a co-creation, a collaboration. Rather, I have listened to the research participants' priorities and learned from them something about how they saw and theorised things. I have reported many of their experiences and theorisations in the articles and in the thesis and I have built my own theorisations on them. With some of the participants, I have discussed my own theorisations and striven to critically incorporate their views on my interpretations.

I have not made Finnish Somalis and people with a refugee background truly participate in the whole process of my research, from designing the research questions, to generating and analysing data, to writing the articles. Rather, I have endeavoured to bring my research and researcher's subjectivity closer to their everyday life – and to mine. To do so, I have critically applied ethics from feminist geography and forced-migration research (**Article III**). Initially, I learned about ethical questions and approaches through encounters and fieldwork, my academic

readings of feminist and anti-racist scholars, participation in anti-racist events and exchanges with colleagues. Later, I increasingly read and wrote academically to theorise what I had learned largely through experience, intuition, values and interactions.

Often, I wrote my notes from participant observation or interviews after "returning from the field", as I had learned from our interactions that acts like reading and writing in everyday spaces such as cafés or playgrounds could look suspicious or intimidating to some people. However, for Article I, due to the lack of time or to avoid forgetting important information emerged from the fieldwork, in a few cases I sat and wrote my observation notes directly in the field, such as in courtyards, in the entrance halls of local blocs of flats or in public leisure areas (**Article I**). My data can be seen as partly limited in quantity and quality compared, for example, to the data available when researchers can record interviews and other interactions. However, when needed, I was able to clarify the data or to collect more by talking again with some research participants or by checking my analyses with some of them. The challenges of obtaining consent did not emerge in my fieldwork with Iraqi men seeking asylum (Marucco, 2017). This may be due to various reasons: for example, the participants from Iraq could have had different experiences with or positions in relation to research, compared to some participants from Somalia. Further, the power relations between me and the participants from Iraq were partly more even than the relations between me and many participants from Somalia. Last but not least, the mutual trust that I had been consolidating –also through activism – with many participants from Iraq and other Iraqis may have played a positive role.

To safeguard the anonymity of all the research participants, in addition to anonymising my notes and the interview transcripts by removing all identifiers – names, addresses, places, professions, … –, I have often written my notes using a form, languages, nicknames and abbreviations that only I can easily understand or interpret. I have been storing the data in a secret, secured place that only I can access. Throughout the articles, when citing the participants, I use pseudonyms that either they have chosen for themselves or that I have created for them. However, given the sensitive and personal topics discussed in the notes and interviews, and because only a fragment of the participants agreed to archiving the data, I decided not to store the data for further research use by other scholars.

During data collection and analysis and the writing phases, I have managed a few times to discuss my interpretations with some research participants or their peers. Whenever possible and suitable for the participants, I have shared the publications or a summary of the research results with many of them. This was one of the ways in which I approached consent as iterative (Mackenzie, McDowell and Pittaway, 2007), i.e. as an ongoing process, asking the participants' consent orally from time to time, in different phases of the research project.

3.2 Life before the paper: times and ethics in research and activism

Before delving into the methodological starting points of this thesis, I would like to emphasise that the knowledge presented here is derived from years of collective experiences gathered through activism, personal life and research (**Article III**; Katisko *et al.*, 2023; Marucco, 2017). This said, I am the only author of the articles and of the synopsis, and, of course, I am solely and fully responsible for my interpretations and the outcomes of this research.

As I have outlined in the introduction to this thesis (1.3.1.), my reflections are situated in the context of asylum in Finland (especially 2016-2019). This context is still characterised by a massive crisis of human rights among people seeking asylum and residence permits more generally. While there is relatively substantial research funding and numerous studies about people seeking asylum, only a minority of people mobilise with and for them, for example through engaged research and/or activism. Specifically, my reflections derive from the experience of encountering some researchers who publish, theorise and build careers on asylum and other processes of marginalisation, while simultaneously they avoid reflexivity and fail to problematise the root causes of the ongoing production of undocumentedness and of other forms of oppression (Ahonen and Kallius, 2019). I have witnessed how many of these researchers may marginalise engaged and activist researchers as "activists, not scientists" (see also Klocker, 2012: 155), and may refuse to engage with the politics of studying migration and violent contexts (Jacobsen and Gilmartin, 2021; Abdelnour and Abu Moghli, 2021). As I will discuss here, the unreflexive approaches of these scholars risk being unethical: indeed, they risk reproducing the status quo in academia and in society, reiterating the forms of violence that erase people in vulnerable positions and racialised migrants (Vasudevan, 2021).

While I critically reflect on my own path using autoethnography, it is not my intention to claim that I am the only researcher practising activism, humanity or solidarity. My point is rather to examine how certain struggles and methodological approaches can be marginalised in specific times and spaces and how such marginalisation can be navigated and resisted. Among the several researchers explicitly engaged in various ways with immigration, asylum, undocumentedness, detention and deportability in Finland in recent years, see for example Bodström (2023), Kaleva and Himanen (2019), Könönen (2018: 57), Leppäkorpi (2022), Lyytinen (2022), and Kynsilehto (2018), just to mention a few.

I explore the methodological aspects of my thesis in **Article III,** joining renewed calls for genuinely engaged research among geographers (Alderman and Inwood, 2019). The title of the article manuscript, "Life before the paper", echoes the dual aim of this thesis, but focuses on researchers and methodologies. It refers to the need to resist the Finnish and European immigration regimes in everyday life (with

"paper" standing for "international protection" and "residence permit") and in praxis by prioritising through *time* and purpose the lives and agendas of people struggling for justice, in addition to writing papers about those lives (with "paper" standing for "academic publication").

The context that I have illustrated in the introduction to this thesis raises questions as to whose agenda, interests and priorities are involved in research (Derickson and Routledge, 2015: 2; Leinonen *et al.*, 2020). Many of us researchers may claim that our academic work is relevant – but relevant for whom, where, how and *when*? (Lyytinen, 2022: 75) The relevance of research may depend significantly on what type of research questions are asked and by whom (Schmidt, 2007: 97). Addressing these inquiries implies making time and space to address the structures and dynamics of power and inequality also within academia (Refstie, 2021: 166). Indeed, as I have already introduced, time is significantly about power relations, indeed as much as space is.

I argue that these methodological questions have ethical, epistemic, practical and thus political implications (Raghuram, 2021: 10), both for researchers and for people navigating deportability in a variety of positions – as people with a refugee background, residents, citizens, activists, family members, significant others, and so on. These questions have consequences for the subjectivities, agencies and praxis of geographers and other researchers, but also for people excluded or marginalised by the nation state (Mountz, 2002: 188).

Activism, activist research and engaged scholarship are central to the work of many geographers across subdisciplines and, currently, many consider it an imperative in numerous contexts across the world (Alderman and Inwood, 2019; Asylum-Network, 2015; Blomley, 2006: 90; Chatterton, 2008; Cuomo, 2021; Hopkins, 2021: 384; Mountz, 2002). As researchers, we are increasingly called to answer the tricky question of how we may contribute not only to academic literature and theory, but also to the daily lives of our research participants and the people among whom we live (Jacobsen, 2021: 596; Shannon *et al.*, 2021: 1159; Wood, Swanson and Colley III, 2020: 436).

However, activism and activist research may not always be welcomed by university administrators (Shannon *et al.*, 2021: 1159). Based on my experience, I would add that also some geographers may not welcome and indeed question activist research, rather than, for example, participating in them or organically supporting the priorities of people struggling for justice (Khé, 2019: 167; **Article III**).

In what follows, I situate myself as a researcher and activist in the relevant literature in geography, highlighting some of its main gaps and addressing them by bridging between feminist and critical geographies, on one side, and forced-migration research, on the other.

3.2.1   Situating activism and myself in geography

Activism as a research topic and as a practice can be found in texts from radical, critical and feminist geographies. The key works on activism as method and praxis that inform this thesis have been published in several journals, such as *Gender, Place and Culture*, *Area*, *ACME* and, to a lesser extent, in the *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, in *Social and Cultural Geography* and in *Progress in Human Geography*. An important reference is the book *Radical Theory/Critical Praxis*, edited by Fuller and Kitchin (2004). In addition, many feminist geographers and feminist political geographers embrace activism in their work (see for example Faria *et al.*, 2020; Jacobsen, 2021; Mountz, 2002; Torres, 2019).

At a glance, the themes related to activism that geographers have explored more recently include several branches: everyday, quiet and gentle activisms (Cinnamon, 2020; Horton, 2021; Jenkins, 2017; Pottinger, 2017, 2020); environmental and climate activism (Halstead *et al.*, 2021; Herbert, 2021; Russell, 2015); disability activism (Morrison *et al.*, 2022); gender, sexuality and activisms (Browne, Brown and Nash, 2021; Johnston, 2017); food justice (Reynolds, Block and Bradley, 2018); the role of emotions in activism (Wolf *et al.*, 2023); legal and asylum activism (Asylum-Network, 2015; Cuomo, 2021; Gill and Hynes, 2021; Jacobsen, 2021).

I understand activism as acting together with others for social justice in a variety of ways, as doing "as much as we can from where we are at … emotionally, physically, financially, politically, etc." (Maxey, 2004: 160). I conceive activism mainly as the basic everyday practices of "being one human to another human" (**Article III**) – despite the exceptional temporalities and practices that activism may end up involving due to the context and structures in question from time to time. With some of the people involved in the knowledge production then infused in this thesis, we would not necessarily call ourselves activists or see what we do as activism (Morrison *et al.*, 2022: 132) – although the term may often be useful to clarify one's approach and expertise. Thus, I understand and practise activism both in more conventional ways (demonstrations, political influencing, legal assistance) and in less structured and more intimate ways (keeping in contact, eating together, chatting, walking) (Pirkkalainen, Näre and Lyytinen, 2022: 6). By encompassing a variety of practices, scales and spaces, my work advocates for more inclusive and democratic – but equally effective and relevant – ideas and practices of activism (Taylor, 2014; Torres, 2019: 162).

One clear strand of geographical work linked with activism focuses on PAR (Participatory Action Research), as set forth e.g. by Pain (2003) in the journal *Progress in Human Geography*. PAR has been a way for radical action-oriented approaches to resurge in geography in the 2000s and 2010s; also, PAR was established to respond to the growing engagements and alliances created between geographers and activists, non-academic communities and organisations (Pain *et al.*,

2013: 29). Related to PAR, there is an interesting strand of literature on experiences, challenges and encouragement among doctoral researchers doing PAR (Bengle and Schuch, 2018; Klocker, 2012).

More recently, some geographers have rightly issued warnings about the normalisation of the participatory approaches, with the risk of watering down their critical potential (Nakamura, 2015; Refstie, 2021). In the context of this thesis, I would like to draw attention particularly to the fact that "participatory approaches involving refugees are not suitable to all research topics and contexts; therefore, their use should always include caution and critical self-reflection" (Lyytinen, 2022: 75). Further, activists and other people in the position of being researched may lack the time and interest to be involved in the research process (Maxey, 1999: 206).

Without intending to belittle the importance and potential of PAR and other participatory approaches, here I focus on something different from "the growing engagements and alliances between geographers and non-academic organizations and activists" that have contributed to boosting PAR in geography (Pain *et al.*, 2013: 29). Indeed, I urge geographers to mobilise as activists – broadly understood, as humans among humans – by recognising their own embeddedness, subjectivities and responsibilities in solidarity with the agendas of activists and of people navigating asylum and deportability (**Article III**; see also Morrison *et al.*, 2022: 132).

In doing so, I subscribe to calls for fully recognising as critical geographers, for learning from and collaborating with people who do not work in or for academia and who strive for social justice: these may be people living in undocumentedness, seeking or holding residence permits; they may be friends, family members, employers, colleagues, teachers, school mates and significant others connected with them, and they may navigate undocumentedness, deportability, asylum or permits in their own positions. They may be NGO workers, volunteers, social and health workers, jurists, and so on. Indeed, "critical geography is not the exclusive confine of the academy. Creative and critical forms of geographical knowledge and praxis are (of course!) produced in multiple sites outside the university" (Blomley, 2008: 287).

My thesis advances geographical discussions on activism also by highlighting the crucial role of time and temporalities at play in it. By doing so, I enrich the existing literature, which tends to focus on the spatial aspects of activism and activist research (Asylum-Network, 2015; Blomley, 2008; Griffin, 2018), thus lacking explicit engagement with time and temporalities, with few exceptions (see e.g. Maynard, 2018; Maxey, 1999: 205).

3.2.2   The segregation of researchers' subjectivities: academic, activist, human

Several geographers study activism and activists, write about dialogues between academia and activism, carry out or reflect on collaborations between academics and activists (e.g. Browne *et al.*, 2017; Jenkins, 2017). Some geographers may be part of social movements, but there has been a long-standing tendency to segregate their activism and other similar forms of engagement from their academic work (Di Feliciantonio, 2017: 431; Kitchin and Hubbard, 1999). This segregation is spatial as much as temporal. With its individualistic tendencies, neoliberal academia asks us to prioritise publishing peer-reviewed papers over engaging with the individuals and communities concerned by our research (Wood, Swanson and Colley III, 2020: 433). The ensuing temporal segregation of purposes and practices implies that attending to the everyday lives of our research participants is an option or an undervalued addition to our academic work (Alderman and Inwood, 2019: 147; **Article III**).

Altogether, the impression is that the focus is more on academic research *per se* as the main source and site of knowledge production, and less on action and other forms of practice. In these studies, the researchers tend to position themselves solely as academics, or then they conduct academic research and no activism or any other practice. When practising engaged research, publishing and teaching can be important ways to contribute to the struggles of people navigating injustice: however, in violent contexts, academic research alone may not always be sufficient to meet these people's priorities in times and spaces relevant for them (Alderman and Inwood, 2019: 148; Lancione, 2017: 997; Maxey, 1999: 204). The problems that I raise here – the lack of reflexivity, of problematisation and of engagement with the communities researched on their terms – are established at the intersections of structural processes, intersubjective dynamics and individual choices, in institutions that both enable and constrain our activist efforts (Gökarıksel *et al.*, 2021: 18). These problems risk diluting our power and responsibilities as academics, contributing to the production of increasingly disembodied analyses and theories that can impact those directly concerned by them. These issues are not new: nearly two decades ago, Fuller and Kitchin wrote that "there are a growing number of radical/critical geographers who have become increasingly dissatisfied with the rhetorical but perceived inert nature of much radical/critical geography" (Fuller and Kitchin, 2004: 5).

To orientate ourselves and our research efforts towards the needs of people struggling for justice, we can position ourselves in various ways and draw from an array of approaches and methods (Staeheli and Lawson 1995, 334; Wood, Swanson and Colley III 2020, 434). In my work, I draw especially from people who identify as both researchers and activists, with the epistemological, ethical, praxis-related and temporal implications that this involves (for example, Chatterton, 2008; Di

Feliciantonio, 2017; Jacobsen, 2021; Kynsilehto, 2017; Lyytinen, 2022; Mackenzie, McDowell and Pittaway, 2007; Moss, 2004). Positionality is a key concept here:

> Positionality determines how social and professional relationships are framed in the field, with consequent effects on research content, analysis and results. However, the literature generally offers limited emphasis on how the researcher's role influences his or her personal research experience, and how this affects both the research process and the academic output (Wesche et al., 2010).

In this thesis, I expand geographical discussions on subjectivities, activism and temporalities calling for more attention, through reflexivity, to the human subjectivities of geographers and researchers imbricated in the production of refugeehood and citizenship and of knowledge about these issues. I highlight the human subjectivities of researchers as the connection and the element through which we can blur between activism, academia and humanity (Maxey, 2004: 169). In other terms, I call for basing geographical research more deeply in everyday life – our own, and those of our research participants and of the communities we live near to – and for "living situated theories in places beyond words so that reality becomes lived rather than merely an object of abstract study" (Routledge, 2004: 80).

Striving for humanisation is particularly necessary and relevant when researching mobilities, asylum and deportability. Following feminist methods, such as autoethnography, the struggle for humanisation is twofold: to humanise the figure of the refugee we need to humanise research, too (Marucco, 2021). To practise radical, emancipatory scholarship that is rooted in solidarity for social and racial justice, as researchers, we must situate ourselves and the institutions where we work within the enduring – national, international and global – structures of violence that pursue the ontological destruction of people with a refugee background, the same structures that we desperately endeavour to criticise and fight (Brankamp and Weima, 2021: 2). In this view, the present and future are "irrevocably shaped by foundational and ontological violence" (Gökarıksel et al., 2021: 14); the racial and legal violence imbued in citizenship and immigration laws are "our collective legacy" and thus concern us all (Vasudevan, 2021: 43).

My attempts at engaging our own and other researchers' humanity bear some commonalities with the idea of "ethics of care" or "relational ethics", which are grounded in reciprocity, reflexivity and positionality. Such ethics are committed to respecting humanity, valuing relationships and honouring one's responsibilities to the communities represented in our research, and also in spaces, times and practices that go beyond ethical protocols (Cahill, Sultana and Pain, 2007: 306; Clark-Kazak, 2021: 132).

3.2.3   The spatio-temporal segregation of geographers' subjectivities

Time and temporalities have ethical, practical and political implications (**Article III**). Researchers participate in producing temporalities through fieldwork, encounters and everyday life. In power-laden contexts such as those of asylum and deportability, the researcher's presence has significant influence on both fieldwork and research results (Schmidt, 2007). Furthermore, researchers who do not navigate refugeehood can become affected by its temporalities in their practice of research and/or in their everyday life, as it happened to me. Therefore, as researchers we must recognise how we practise our own spatio-temporal imaginaries throughout the research process, from designing the research agenda to writing the analysis; these spatio-temporal imaginaries are also practised in embodied and affective encounters – during fieldwork and beyond – "in contexts where (political) nationalism materialises through law and policy" (Drangsland, 2021: 82). This entails reflecting on how we position ourselves alongside temporalities of violence and of knowledge production (Gökarıksel *et al.*, 2021: 14, 19).

As I have set forth in the theoretical framework (2.2.1.), the temporalities of people with a refugee background can be seen as "a constellation of interrelations, that are biological, material, legal and affective … these are also relations of power (in which the researcher is situated)" (Drangsland, 2021: 86). Such relations of power include "the differential positions that we inhabit within intersecting global orders of race, class, gender, dis/ability and geographical location" (Brankamp and Weima, 2021: 5).

These points underline the need for critical, heightened or political reflexivity (Abdelnour and Abu Moghli, 2021; Țîștea, 2020). Precisely, they urge us to extend our reflexivity beyond analyses of our positionalities to become aware of how we imagine, produce and participate in temporalities throughout the research process, from drafting the research questions to writing our interpretations and disseminating the research results (Vasudevan, 2021). As researchers, we need to interrogate the positions from where each of us is speaking when telling stories about people with a refugee background (Drangsland, 2021: 85). This bears implications for geographers' subjectivities and agencies, and thus praxis. The development of geographer's reflected, multiple subjectivities cannot be a merely intellectual process, but it also requires action, activism and critical reflection in order to become praxis (Freire, 1970, in Cahill, 2007: 288).

To substantiate my claim, in what follows, I combine the relevant geographical literature about activism and critical praxis with the literature on ethics in forced-migration research (**Article III**). In research on forced migration, ethics, politics and ontologies are inextricably intertwined; thus, researchers are responsible for unveiling and challenging power imbalances and marginalising processes, and for

reflecting and acting on the implications of the knowledge they partake in producing (Jacobsen and Gilmartin, 2021: 71). Many scholars studying forced migration position themselves and act as "academics and advocates, writers and activists" critically interrogating constructions of and reactions to refugeehood (Brankamp and Weima, 2021: 4).

The crucial questions here are why and for whom we do research, who designs the agenda and for whom do we claim that the research is relevant (Leinonen *et al.*, 2020). Here I follow "the key principle of not conducting academic research on refugees unless it is inherently for and, when they desire this, also with refugees" (Lyytinen, 2022: 75). This principle opens possibilities for a "politics of refusal" which recognises "the limits of research to bring about material change and considers when [research] is and is not an appropriate and desirable intervention": research may not be desirable or appropriate in cases when substantial ethical and emotional risks may be engendered by a research project, or when the temporalities and methods of research would be largely irrelevant to the temporalities of those directly concerned by it (Wood, Swanson and Colley III, 2020: 437; see also Derickson and Routledge, 2015: 5; **Article III**).

Expanding on the dual imperative of refugee studies, according to which research should be both academically sound and policy relevant (Jacobsen and Landau, 2003), an increasing number of researchers have come to understand their work as having to actively contribute to improving the conditions of people navigating refugeehood and deportability beyond the principle of "doing no harm":

> If researchers are in a position to assist refugees to advocate on their own behalf or on behalf of others who have been subjected to these kinds of abuses, then it is morally incumbent on them to do so. (Mackenzie, McDowell and Pittaway, 2007: 316)

Therefore, I suggest that, as scholars, we should be open to enacting also other practices in addition to writing papers – or to include these practices in our writing and teaching –, if the temporalities of the people whose lives we examine and who struggle for justice require so (Mountz, 2002; Shannon *et al.*, 2021: 1153). In my case, one example of other practices is represented by *feminist legal collaboration*, "a method and praxis that enables researchers and others to engage directly with legal struggles on the ground and gain a more situated understanding of the everyday realities and materialities of law-in-practice" (Jacobsen, 2021: 596). As I relate in **Article III**, I engaged in feminist legal collaboration by assisting in asylum and residence permit processes, by collectively lobbying decision makers and by educating and informing my own circles about asylum . Beyond the legal, dimension,

I have participated in taking care of each other together with some people navigating deportability in their everyday life.

Having said all this, engaged scholarship and activism encounter a number of constraints and challenges at various degrees in academia – such as material, ethical, epistemological and emotional ones, just to mention a few. I reflect more in detail on these tensions in **Article III**. Furthermore, it should be emphasised that advocacy, activism and other practices are not automatically selfless and ethical. Further, they risk being mainstreamed, tokenised or co-opted into producing data or advancing one's career. Rather, I claim, research and other practices should be placed at the service of the actual needs of people seeking justice (**Article III**). In doing so, activist researchers should carefully strive to enact non-hierarchical approaches to knowledge and to address both immediate local needs and broader structural inequalities (Jacobsen, 2021: 596; Shannon *et al.*, 2021: 1159).

As researchers, we can be vocal about the various forms of critical praxis that activism for migratory justice requires, their outputs and their possible impacts, e.g. by inspiring colleagues and funders to recognise them. Writing from the same context where I have conducted my research, participated in activism and lived in the recent years, Lyytinen says:

> [W]e should rethink societal impact and revisit whether in this context it may also include issues such as these: did we manage to put legal force behind someone's right to stay in Finland? Did we enable stopping an illegal deportation? Have we fought for access to services that people might otherwise not have received? (Lyytinen, 2022: 77)

This should all be done in solidarity with those directly concerned – in this case, people with a refugee background – and not for the sake of research or of publishing papers. Research should be one of the means in the collective struggles towards a fairer society – not the other way round. Altogether, "the ongoing economic, political, and ecological crises confronting humanity urgently necessitate engagement" (Derickson and Routledge, 2015: 4).

This said, acting to one another like humans by doing what we can from where we are at (Maxey, 2004: 160) should not come at the cost of researchers' and their close ones' wellbeing within and beyond academia (**Article III**). Engaging meaningfully with individuals and communities fighting for their lives can significantly impact our wellbeing and emotional health; the time needed to heal oneself and others is scarce and needed also for e.g. self-realisation, family life, financial stability, career and other priorities we may have as researchers and humans (Wood, Swanson & Colley III, 2020: 433-434). I believe that a balance between

engagement and care is possible, although complicated by the academic and other relationships we inhabit.

4 Life Before the Passport: Results and Discussion

According to its title, this research has had two main purposes. First, to cast light on how people with a refugee background create their space every day and practise their mundane agency before and after obtaining asylum or any other kind of residence permit in their country of asylum or new residence. Second, to re-centre the lives of people with a refugee background vis à vis immigration laws, authorities and documents, such as the passport and other "papers".

In what follows, I present the outcomes of this research with regard to each of these two purposes. In the first two sections of this chapter (4.1. and 4.2.), I address the results of the articles and their theoretical implications, thus answering Research Questions 1 and 2, respectively: *What are the common priorities and temporalities among people with a refugee background?* and *From a theoretical point of view, what do these temporalities imply for the integration and subjectivities of migrants in Finland?* In the final section of this chapter (4.3.), I address the methodological considerations deriving from this whole research process, thus answering Research Question 3: *What are the methodological implications of the present thesis and research process?*

In addition to the data collected specifically for my doctoral research and in addition to the interpretations written in the three doctoral articles, in this discussion chapter, I sometimes draw on the broader research and activist work that I have been participating in during the time of my doctoral studies. As I have mentioned in the introduction (1.2.), a significant part of the knowledge I use in this thesis comes from my involvement as an activist with We See You and the project Every Woman's Centre and, to some extent, from my research in the project URMI (Marucco, 2017) and the project about social rights and undocumentedness commissioned by the Finnish Government (Katisko *et al.*, 2023).

4.1 Priorities and temporalities among people with a refugee background along the refugeehood-citizenship continuum

Research question 1: What are the common priorities and temporalities along the refugeehood-citizenship continuum among people with a refugee background? I.e. across legal status, what allows people to move towards citizenship and gain fuller control over their own everyday time? What restricts their spatio-temporal agency and forces them towards refugeehood?

In this section, I discuss some of the main priorities of various people with a refugee background that have emerged through the research. I illustrate the roles these priorities and themes perform through time and across different legal statuses, i.e. seeking and/or obtaining asylum, a residence permit, and Finnish citizenship. The discussion is based on the common themes emerging from my three scientific articles and the overall research process. Throughout the research, recurring priorities and lived dimensions along the continuum were represented by employment, family relationships, racism and mobilities – apart from the residence permit and citizenship themselves.

The following sections of this chapter highlight how people with a refugee background practise citizenship and mundane political agency irrespective of their legal status. People can navigate the temporalities set by the legal system and also create other futurities by pursuing their own priorities – such as making a home, studying, working, doing something they find meaningful – well *before* obtaining a Finnish passport or a residence permit and while living under the threat of deportation (Marucco, 2017).

Thus, people with a refugee background create their futures in a myriad of ways in their "now", even before officialising their status in Finland. By doing so, they "reclaim waiting as a liveable space" (Meier and Donà, 2021: 57). In other words, people make considerable efforts and do different things while waiting. As such, although many people waiting for asylum may at times see their life as empty, their waiting is somehow full, too (Khosravi, 2021). However, researchers, activists and others should be careful not to normalise people with a refugee background as having to be active.

At the same time, in some regards, the national immigration and integration regimes play a central role in restraining the agencies, mobilities and temporalities of people with a refugee background. My research findings show that being granted asylum or any other kind of permit and achieving Finnish citizenship are all priorities for people with a refugee background. The temporalities created by the legal status they hold pervade their everyday lives. Also *after* obtaining the citizenship of the country of asylum, some people may experience the forms of spatio-temporal confinement which recall those of refugeehood in certain dimensions of their

everyday life. Thus, "a sense of displacement and exclusionary practices" can endure after officialising an individual's status in their new country (Drangsland, 2021: 84).

Waiting, slowness and spatio-temporal confinement do not clearly/always end when a person receives asylum, a residence permit or even citizenship. People wait for the renewal of permits, for decisions on permits that they have applied for on new grounds, for citizenship – and for services, if they are considered to be unidentified and are denied online banking credentials. My findings put temporal linearities of refugeehood and citizenship into question, enriching the existing scientific literature with original empirical data and advancing it through the novel idea of segregated subjectivities.

4.1.1   Global and local mobilities: the idolatry of passports

In this subsection, I illustrate how passports – both of the attributed country of origin and of the country of seeking asylum, in this case Finland – and residence permits are set as priorities, in different ways, both by the people seeking and holding these documents, and by the Finnish state and immigration system. In general, I argue here that the current Finnish immigration system induces a distortion or subversion between the passport and the lives of people on the move, with the passport being transformed from a means enabling life, to an end which constrains agencies and mobilities.

One of the priorities of many, if not all, the people with a refugee background that I have encountered is to obtain Finnish citizenship (**Article II**). Based on what the research participants said (Marucco, 2017), European and Finnish citizenship can be seen as strong protection against deportation. For many people whose mobilities to/in their destinations are restricted, such as Europe, obtaining a permanent permit and especially citizenship from Finland can remove the horizon of deportations from their futures (ibid.: 86). It should be noticed, however, that the possibility of citizenship revocation in specific cases, and thus of deportation, also exists in Finland.[6]

Many of the people I encountered arrived in Finland as asylum seekers, but never received asylum. Many of them tried to officialise their status in Finland by applying for another permit – i.e. one based on family ties, studies or work. Generally, according to the Finnish legislation, holding a valid passport from one's attributed country of origin is a compulsory requirement for obtaining one of these permits (Aliens Act, 2004 § 35; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2022a: 8).

---

[6]   The issue of citizenship revocation did not emerge in my research fieldwork or activism.

For several reasons, people with a refugee background – and sometimes women especially – may be unable to obtain a passport (**Article II**: 116; Bassel, 2008: 309; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2022a: 12). However, some people with a refugee background may be able to provide other documents, such as national identity cards or birth certificates. According to the law, Migri could grant a so-called alien's passport "to aliens residing in Finland if the alien cannot obtain a passport from the authorities of his or her [sic] home country, if he or she is stateless or if there are other special reasons for issuing an alien's passport to him or her" (Aliens Act § 134).

Nonetheless, in the Finnish legislation and migration authorities' interpretations, there are tensions between the provision setting the passport requirement (Aliens Act § 35) and the provision regulating the granting of the alien's passport (ibid. § 134). Thus, many people who fulfil all the other permit requirements and could obtain the permit if granted an alien's passport, are denied the alien's passport and, as a consequence, the permit. Various organisations, researchers and people navigating permits have advanced numerous proposals for making the granting criteria of the alien's passport more reasonable (see for example Katisko *et al.*, 2023: 85; Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021: 240; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2022b: 40). However, these proposals have not being received and implemented.

As a consequence, there are people who arrived in Finland as asylum seekers after 2014 who have not been granted international protection, who have been living in Finland for years and have been denied other permits based on the lack of a passport, despite fulfilling all the other permit requirements. In other words, many people who have integrated through work, language, family and who have ties to Finland, have been deported or driven into undocumentedness only for documents that they were unable to obtain – and that, anyway, Finland may not recognise, such as in the case of many documents issued by Somalia (**Article II**: 116)[7].

This example is one of the various ways in which Finland has been prioritising papers – namely the passport of the attributed country of origin – over the lives of people with a refugee background. Therefore, while holding a passport is a means and one of the requirements for receiving a residence permit allowing people to live their life in Finland, the Finnish immigration authorities have prioritised the passport of the attributed country of origin or of previous residence and transformed into the end purpose, the main point in question.

---

[7]   In the case of Somalia, for example, at the time of writing this thesis, the only travel document issued by Somalia that Finland accepts is the Somali biometric diplomatic passport (ePassport) which was introduced in 2014 (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, n.d.).

Legally speaking, prioritising the passport over a person's actual life can cause deportation or undocumentedness, thus ending the futurities that people with a refugee background have been constructing for years in Finland. This bears material, social and affective consequences for the people who are denied a permit, their families and others who care about them, too. After witnessing this as an activist and a human, I have conceptualised it as "idolatry of the passport": as Moni Ovadia put it, "idolatry is switching the means for the end. When this is the case, we stop seeing and feeling the suffering of our fellow human beings" (Ovadia, 2008: 99, my translation).

As regards the Finnish passport, in the data from the research participants, on a global scale this document is seen as a key to travelling to meet families and friends abroad, who may be scattered across different countries (**Article II**: 115; Birkvad, 2019). These transnational and global connections can open new futures for family life, employment, studies or social connections in Finland and beyond – as discussed during their leisure time by some of the Finnish Somali men I interviewed (**Article I**: 94).

On an everyday local scale, a relevant case is that of the online banking credentials, which grant access to all the public services of the Finnish welfare state (**Article II**: 115). For people to be granted online banking credentials, to access these online services and thus to be able to control their own daily spatio-temporalities, their identity has to be ascertained. Identity can be ascertained in numerous ways, and not solely through documents issued by Finland, such as residence permits. Indeed, holding a residence permit or Finnish citizenship should not be a formal requirement to obtain online banking credentials; nonetheless, some banks or bank workers may discriminatorily demand the permit in order to grant online banking credentials (ibid.: 116). These discriminatory practices contribute to producing differences and inequalities not only between citizens and people holding a permit, but also between people holding or waiting for a permit.

If a person's identity is not ascertained, people can be denied online banking credentials, meaning that they have to book in-place appointments or queue for any service they may need – from health care to social services, to handling tax matters and making payments (**Article II**: 115). Thus, the online banking credentials can be seen as a surveillant form of governance which impacts the everyday temporalities of people with a refugee background and requires them to prove their right to stay within certain spaces and borders (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xvi; Tervonen, Pellander and Yuval-Davis, 2018: 140).

4.1.2   Employment

Through the research and activism that I have been conducting since 2016, I have understood the significance of being able to work (in the sense of being in paid employment) for people with a refugee background across differing legal statuses, i.e. for people seeking asylum, holding a permit or having obtained Finnish citizenship (Marucco, 2017; **Article II**). Simultaneously, some aspects linked with employment can restrict their agency in their everyday life and over many years. In the following paragraphs, I illustrate this ambivalence by focusing on employment first from the perspective people still seeking asylum, then from the perspective of people who have obtained a permit and, finally, from the perspective of people who have applied for or obtained Finnish citizenship.

For many people seeking asylum[8], being able to work offers an everyday temporal routine, material spaces and social encounters which may help people distract themselves from waiting for their permit, from the fear of deportation and from anxieties about their families (Marucco, 2017). In addition, for many people waiting for asylum, paid employment means the possibility to make a living and increase their income, thus becoming independent from the limited reception support and services that they are entitled to as asylum seekers.

Together with studying the Finnish language and for a professional degree, some people still waiting for asylum use their studies and work to create new futurities for themselves (Näre, Bendixsen and Maury, 2022: 24). While "getting the paper" is seen by probably all people seeking asylum as their priority, at times some people may also pursue other priorities, such as working or studying. In this way, they may distract themselves from waiting for the paper, make an income for themselves and possibly their families and fill their time with more meaning (Marucco, 2017: 99). Thus, being able to work allows some people to achieve part of their priorities regardless of their legal status. As such, the capacity to work can precede the permit both in terms of time and of importance.

Allegedly concerned with the labour shortage and an ageing population (see also Drangsland, 2021: 76), in the past years Finland has been mainstreaming labour-based migration. On their part, people seeking asylum may create alternative futurities for themselves through employment also by applying for a work-based permit. While the futurities envisaged by the state of Finland and by some asylum seekers who are in paid employment may seem to be aligned to some extent, the crucial questions are for whom and based on whose interests these futurities are envisaged.

---

[8]   In Finland, based on the current law, people who seek asylum and who do not hold another permit yet have the right to work only in certain phases of their asylum processes.

As regards people who have managed to obtain a residence permit, their mobility in the labour market and the time they can or should spend in paid employment on a weekly basis and over the years depend on the permit they hold (however, if a person received international protection, they have unlimited right to work in terms of the field and the working hours; for more details, see further, section 4.2.1.). Thus, employment may enable and support agency, depending on the person's situation, if given as a right and possibility (**Article II**: 118). As such, it can help people move towards the citizenship side of the continuum, regardless of what legal status the person holds, if any. Becoming employed can make a person feel that their skills are valued. Employment produces income, which in turn can help achieve one's priorities, including financial security for oneself, one's family and significant others; income can go into remittances or into travelling, also to families abroad (ibid.).

Simultaneously, employment can constrain a person's agency, for instance if their residence permit is based on work and their life circumstances or plans change, or, again, if their life circumstances and plans depend on the income requirements set by the law (for example in many cases of family reunification). In such cases, work as a key to staying in Finland – and/or providing for a family – may sometimes weigh more than dreams to change workplaces, change professional field, or dedicate time to studying. As such, employment may also come to constitute a form of spatio-temporal confinement; it may produce some people into a precarious and flexible labour force (Könönen, 2018; Maury, 2021), thus restricting their futurities and pushing them towards the refugeehood side of the continuum.

In respect of people who have applied for or obtained Finnish citizenship, becoming employed emerged through my research about Finnish Somali women's lived citizenship as being very significant (**Article II**). To the participants of this research, paid employment meant having one's own money and not having to rely on social security. It should be noted that proof of a secure income is also a requirement for applying for Finnish citizenship, and for residence permits (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023c); usually, such income is secured through work.

According to my analysis, even after obtaining citizenship, employment is a relevant dimension to many people with a refugee background. Some participants suggested that having a Finnish passport is different from having a job (**Article II**: 119). Widespread racism at the level of the recruiting companies often bars racialised people from accessing the job market (Ahmad, 2020; Alho, 2021: 88; **Article I**: 99). It should be noted that racism affects both people seeking a permit and people who have Finnish citizenship, either by acquisition or by birth. As such, it is different from the thresholds encountered specifically by people who are applying for a permit in Finland. Thus, somehow, the struggle for people with a refugee background to

realise themselves may not end when they have access to a permit or even citizenship.

I will now briefly discuss work in relation to leisure (**Article I**). The spatio-temporalities of work and leisure are connected to each other in several ways. One interesting finding of my study about leisure is that it highlights how practices of leisure and work can be spatio-temporally discrete or, instead, allow multiple subjectivities and practices, such as work and leisure, to co-exist. The research participants' accounts of what they do where and when inspired me to think about what I do where and when as a researcher, a human being and an activist; therefore, I discuss the methodological implications of this research later in this chapter (see section 4.3.).

In the research, I have let the participants define leisure themselves (Chick, 1998: 115–116). This was important because amplifying the participants' own definitions of themselves, of their priorities and of their leisure time is the objective of my work; moreover, the practice of defining can be considered a use of power (**Article II**: 111; Lorde, 1984: 137). Their accounts suggest that leisure may not simply be understood as time which is free from work i.e. paid employment. In some cases, depending on how leisure time was understood, it was unclear whether women who are working at home and entrepreneurs have any leisure time at all (**Article I**: 93).

My fieldwork and analysis highlight gendered understandings and practices of work which involve housework – mostly for women and girls – and various forms of care and support. These understandings show that the daily spatio-temporal boundaries between leisure and work broadly understood may sometimes be blurred; thus, some women's various subjectivities – e.g. as mothers, students, workers, and so on – may be deployed simultaneously, or "flow" into one another (**Article I**: 95). For example, the leisure practices among Finnish Somali mothers can be sponta-neous, spatio-temporally fragmented and dispersed here and there between one daily chore and another, especially for women who are not in full-time paid employment (**Article I**: 96).

Some of the Somali women I talked to for this research have compared the spatio-temporalities of their leisure when they were living in Somalia and now as they live in Finland. In Somalia, their practices of housework and leisure could flow into each other and overlap in temporal and spatial terms. In contrast, they felt that, in Finland, different practices are each allocated their specific time and space: hence, during their day, they have one hour to study the Finnish language, one hour to clean, one to eat, one to read the Qur'an, and so on (**Article I**: 96).

The leisure time of some newly arrived people with a refugee background can be defined, delineated and constrained by the spatio-temporal organisation of their daily activities in their new home country (Spracklen, Long and Hylton, 2015: 114). In this regard, it should be noted that the ability to define one's own leisure time,

spaces and practices can provide people with safe space against racism and other forms of oppression (Juniu, 2000: 377), allow them to cultivate social relations and to recover their individual identity, status and subjectivity, which may have been damaged in the migration process (Farrer, 2004).

Lastly, I discuss the relationship between work and leisure and how the spatio-temporal boundaries between these two domains may at times become blurred. My analysis suggests that some of the workplaces of the research participants allow multiple, spontaneous and overlapping practices at the same time. For example, cafés and shops are not just places of work, purchase and consumption, but also places for friends – meaning both the customers and the workers – to stop by and say hello, to sit and chat. I further discuss this multiplicity of spaces later in this chapter (see section 4.2.1.).

4.1.3   Family life

The family, either the family of origin or the one created by people with a refugee background themselves, has emerged as an important theme throughout the research. Somehow similar to the dimension of work, the dimension of the family also presented some ambivalence as to its capacity to support the full self-realisation of people with a refugee background and to accompany them towards the citizenship side of the continuum.

Based on the data that I have collected and on the activism that I have conducted, the family often recurs as a central – and often positive – dimension in the life of people with a refugee background, connecting their pasts, presents and futures (**Article I**; **Article II**). In this regard, it may be useful to remember that I have worked solely with people who have moved to Finland as adults, or who are over twenty years old. For many of the people that I have encountered, taking care of their family is a priority. In my analysis, the family often constitutes a space of citizenship which can help people advance towards feelings of full participation and self-realisation.

Due to the restricted access I had to the field, the data that I gathered for this research is somehow limited (as previously mentioned, see section 3.1.). The data shows family life as both care and work on different scales, from the local to the transnational and the global (Al-Sharmani, 2007; **Article II**; Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1547). At the local level, some of the Finnish Somali women I interviewed progressively appropriated city space and possibly increased their urban belonging by taking care of their families every day (**Article II**: 120).

Across genders and ethnicities, many of the people with a refugee background that I have encountered live family life transnationally, both in Finland and beyond (for example, see **Article II**: 115). In this regard, the dimension of the family was

directly linked with the recurrent meaning of citizenship as passport. Obtaining a Finnish passport means to be able to travel safely to visit families abroad – and to have the right to return to Finland.

The family also intersects with the other spatio-temporal dimensions and the priorities of people with a refugee background discussed here, such as leisure and employment. This is not surprising, as paid employment and work at large often tend to structure temporal patterns in all – not only refugee – families (Ho, 2021: 1670). Many Finnish Somalis I talked to would spend significant portions of their leisure time visiting friends, neighbours and their extended family (**Article I**: 94). Concerning paid and unpaid work, Finnish Somali parents often organise their life in spatial and temporal terms in gendered ways, so that many women focus on taking care of their small children and family, while men focus on obtaining a degree and accessing paid employment to materially provide for their family. At times, women may pursue their studies and employment only after their children have gone to kindergarten (ibid.: 97). However, this strategy or practice should not be generalised, as the situation varies from family to family. Many of the women I talked to were also studying the Finnish language, training for their profession, doing work practice, searching for jobs or were in paid employment while having small children (**Article II**).

Sometimes, the time women invest in taking care of their family and children can also cause tension with the development of their Finnish language skills and with their access to employment, whether these are the futurities that women set for themselves or that the state envisages for them (**Article II**: 118; Finnish Government, 2022; see further subsection 4.2.). Simultaneously, it is important to notice that, in a context where racism is widespread in an array of spaces from the institutional, to the cultural and the everyday, the time racialised mothers and parents in general spend with their family can provide their children with a racially safer space of love and care (hooks, 1990: 177, in Painter and Philo, 1995: 116).

Sometimes, one's position in the family and familial temporalities can restrain the agency of people with a refugee background, too. My research shows some aspects of the gendering of leisure practices and of the intersecting temporalities of paid work and of care work for one's family. For instance, some families may ask their daughters to spend their leisure time doing daily chores or to materialise it into some artefact or skill (**Article I**: 96, 97).

Among Finnish Somalis, it is often mothers who do most of the work of raising their children (Ismail, 2016). Some mothers with a refugee background may have their plans to learn the Finnish or Swedish language slowed down, if they invest most of their time into family care for many years and do not experience work outside the home (**Article II**: 120).

In conclusion, family life in Finland and transnationally can be seen as a future that people with a refugee background reclaim (**Article II**: 119). In doing so, people with a refugee background may enact multiple subjectivities both simultaneously and at different times. Concurrently, families can become sites of struggle, not only against the state, but also among family members, in Finland and transnationally (Kallio, 2019; see also Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1547). Attending to the everyday lives and priorities of people with a refugee background is important in order to understand that, to be full citizens, many of them need to balance between employment and family life (**Article II**: 119) – in coevalness with many other people who have never become refugees.

Through my research about lived citizenship, I have learned that it is important to grasp the everyday priorities of people with a refugee background beyond explicitly discussions around concepts like "citizenship", "integration" and so on. By focusing on their own priorities, I was able to better comprehend the ways in which many people with a refugee background may create open-ended and collective futurities by advancing their own employment and that of their families, in contrast with how the state "interpellates" them as individualised workers-to-be (**Article II**: 121; Bassel, 2008).

4.1.4   Racism

It should be noted that few research participants talked with me about racism. There may be several reasons for this (see e.g. Petäjäniemi, Lanas and Kaukko, 2021: 291–292 and Rask *et al.*, 2018: 902). I learned more about racism by doing participant observation, spending time with participants and other people with a refugee background, acting together against racist attacks, doing activism in We See You or helping in legal cases.

Racism and whiteness can push people with a refugee background into the spatio-temporal confinement associated with uprooting, displacement and refugeehood (**Article II**: 117; De Genova *et al.*, 2021: 54). Thus, obtaining Finnish citizenship may sometimes bring no meaningful change in some regards, if the new citizen remains positioned as a racialised "alien" (**Article II**: ibid.). Similarly, some participants felt that Finnish employers would rather hire white, native Finns instead of them, even though they are Finnish citizens and speak Finnish (or Swedish) fluently (ibid.: 118). Further, racism and the whiteness of many Finnish public and leisure spaces can significantly influence the spatio-temporalities of leisure time among people with a refugee background (**Article I**: 99).

Whether people are undocumented, waiting for asylum or a residence permit, hold a Finnish permit or citizenship, or were born into Finnish citizenship, racism can affect their temporalities and constrain their agencies, forcing them to the

refugeehood side of the continuum. Thus, racism can cause both people with a refugee background and native, racialised Finnish citizens to experience precarious temporalities, a disjuncture between their legal status and lived reality, which can be understood as 'heteronomous times' (**Article II**: 121; Cwerner, 2001: 19).

Turning to the state, racism has shaped a considerable part of the current Finnish asylum politics (Keskinen, 2016: 362). The will to keep certain bodies and people out of Finland has been exemplified in discourses and practices. Racism and coloniality are manifest in the fact that the temporary protection directive was activated this time for people fleeing the Ukraine and not before for people fleeing other violent contexts (Kynsilehto, 2022); they also manifest in how the reception system has been organised and in the recent discourses around people fleeing the Ukraine (for example, United Nations, 2022), although these discourses include different tropes than the discourses concerning e.g. Somalis and Iraqis who arrived in Finland as refugees or other people who sought asylum in Finland in 2015.

It is extremely important that the temporary protection directive was activated for people fleeing the Ukraine and that the Finnish reception system was prepared to support people arriving as refugees. However, Europe and Finland have constructed a "myth of difference" (Mayblin, 2014) against people and refugees who have been endeavouring to migrate to Europe from outside the EU or who may have arrived here through dangerous journeys. As Kynsilehto states (2022), solidarity and a sense of shared responsibility need not be a zero-sum game.

In the present section, I have discussed the temporalities of people with a refugee background with regard to the main factors moving them along the refugeehood-citizenship continuum. In the next section, I move on to illustrating the results of my research connected to my second research question.

4.2   Questioning linear temporalities of integration

Research questions 2: From a theoretical point of view, what do these temporalities imply for the integration and subjectivities of migrants in Finland?

The linear temporalities permeating the global, EU and Finnish immigration and integration regimes have a performative element in that they make certain subjectivities, and not others, available for people with a refugee background (Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021: 5; Könönen, 2018: 58; see also Nyers, 2013). By doing so, they take space and time and often years of life, every day. In addition, they can impact social relationships, health, emotions and dreams, which are important dimensions of integration (Heikkilä and Lyytinen, 2019: 338; Kakil, n.d.).

In theory, in Finland, integration is said to start during the time the person is still at the reception centre (Finnish Government, 2019: 139). In practice, however, the agencies of people with a refugee background are expected to follow a certain

national order, which in the context of this research starts with a residence permit, continues with proficiency in the national language(s) and employability, to eventually culminate in Finnish citizenship.

The temporalities – the start, progress, aim and accomplishment – of integration depend largely on whose definition of integration we use. Another important question is how deportability impacts integration. Further, national linear temporalities do not engage with any other possible priorities that people with a refugee background may have – or any other order in which they may achieve the goals set by official integration discourses. For these reasons, the voices of people who navigate integration and deportability need to be listened to.

In what follows, I discuss how linear discourses of integration do not reflect the lives of many people with a refugee background (**Article II**: 110). Integration emerges from my analysis as a process towards (Finnish) language learning, employment and financial independence. In contrast with such temporal linearity, people experience disruptions, changes and waiting throughout their paths toward integration.

In addition, national linear narratives of integration imply that people with a refugee background are supposed to fully realise themselves solely through language proficiency, employment and obtaining Finnish citizenship in an undefined future (Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021: 9). However, everybody brings to Finland and along their integration paths experiences, goals, knowledges and histories which should not be overlooked (**Article II**: 119; Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1559).

Based on my data and analysis, the Finnish migration and integration regimes produce people to be integrated mostly as single, employable individuals. In contrast, a sense of collectivity and of relational temporalities emerges from my analysis of informal integration and of the meanings of citizenship among Finnish Somali women (**Article I**: 98; **Article II**: 122). The temporalities of people with a refugee background and of migrants more broadly involve "different geographies, other people and different phases of life", and as such they are never a merely individual action (Khosravi, 2021: 203).

One more way in which linear assumptions should be questioned and dismissed is that the time that a person has spent living in Finland may not automatically indicate the level of their Finnish language skills. Indeed, people with a refugee background do a lot of work to rebuild their lives and may have to balance between different priorities. For example, the time that especially women have spent living in Finland and learning the Finnish language may not be directly proportional to their language proficiency and status as un-/employed (**Article II**: 120).

Similarly, a person may have lived in Finland for many years as an asylum seeker, become employed, learned the local languages and lived their family life. However, if they do not receive international protection but other permits, the day

when they receive their permit is officially recognised as the first day they moved to Finland. An exception to this is constituted by permits granted on the basis of international protection: in these cases, the period of residence is seen as starting on the day the application which received international protection was made. This asynchrony between the life that people have been living in Finland and the portion of their life that Finland officially recognises, is more than symbolic; for example, the officially recognised time of residence in Finland is the only time that counts when applying for permanent permits or Finnish citizenship (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023d, 2023e).

One further challenge emerging from this research to the mainstream understanding of integration concerns who is assumed to do what in integration. I have witnessed numerous cases of informal integration done by individuals with differing legal statuses throughout my research and activism. For example, I have drawn attention to the role of co-ethnics acting in various languages, as individuals or for example as members of NGOs and thus supporting the integration of people immediately after their arrival in Finland as asylum seekers (**Article I**: 98).

Similarly, like the Finnish Somali mothers that I have interviewed, one can expect mothers and parents with a refugee background from other ethnic groups to creatively engage with multiple temporalities to advance their own integration and that of their family members, be they in Finland and/or elsewhere (**Article II**: 119). This research also raised views on integration as being a two-way process (**Article I**: 100): it suggests that Finnish Somalis and more broadly people with a refugee background should be seen as knowledgeable subjects from whom the majority Finns may have something to learn. However, at the same time, it is interesting that these participants framed integration namely as a two-way process and not e.g. as a multiple-way one.

In the next section, I move beyond integration to discuss more specifically some of the implications of the Finnish residence permit system for the subjectivities of people with a refugee background.

4.2.1 Implications for the subjectivities of people with a refugee background

According to the title of this thesis, one of the aims of my research is to contribute to re-centring the lives and subjectivities of people with a refugee background *vis à vis* migration regimes. In this section, I expand the point that I have made about idolatry (see previously, subsection 4.1.1) to reflect on the implications that the current Finnish asylum and immigration law and practices have on the subjectivities of people with a refugee background. In other words, in what follows, I touch on

what kind of subjectivities the Finnish immigration regime makes available for people with a refugee background.

As part of my doctoral research, I have come to envisage some of such implications through both my doctoral fieldwork and articles, and, significantly, through my work in other research projects (such as Marucco, 2017 and Katisko *et al.*, 2023) and my participation in activism together with We See You and Every Woman's Centre. My understanding of these implications has influenced my analyses and writing (especially the writing of **Article II** and **Article III** and of this synopsis). Furthermore, I need to disentangle these implications in order to advocate for life before the passport. Therefore, I briefly illustrate such implications, although their analysis is not directly included in the doctoral articles, and I place my observations in dialogue with the relevant policy documents, reports and scientific literature.

As I have illustrated in the introduction to this synopsis, the numerous changes made by the Sipilä government to the Finnish immigration law (the Aliens Act), were often coupled with strict interpretations by Migri and the courts – and this is still the case currently (**Article III**; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023: 23). A question in point is what the aim of the Finnish immigration law is and what is its relationship with the implementation of fundamental and human rights. This question has recently been posed, among others, by various actors in dialogues with the Finnish Ministry of the Interior (The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023: ibid.). Currently, the Finnish asylum and immigration law can be seen as concentrating more on the agency of the immigration authorities, than on that of people seeking and holding permits. The law needs to shift its focus from restricting immigration to making immigration smoother for those migrating (ibid.: 13; see also Human Rights Centre, 2023: 56). The residence permit system is, indeed, an extension of national borders (Könönen, 2018: 55).

One of the consequences of the law reforms enacted after 2015 is that, since then, obtaining a residence permit has become increasingly difficult in Finland. The changes have caused many people to "fall in between" the various permit categories and have stimulated the production of undocumentedness. A proliferation of rules and the complicated relations between permit categories constitute a considerable burden for permit holders and seekers (The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023: 13). Despite some improvements undertaken during the government mandate of prime minister Sanna Marin (Amnesty International, 2023), these negative effects are still visible at the time this thesis is being written, as many people specifically targeted by the previous law changes are still living in Finland as undocumented.

As identified by a research project in which I participated (Katisko *et al.*, 2023: 21–23), at the moment in Finland there are numerous "groups" of undocumented

people in a wide range of situations. These groups include people who never had a residence permit or even a permit application in Finland, to people who once had permits based on marriage, work, studies, or international protection, but then lost them or could not renew them. Regardless of whether they ever held permits or not, many people navigating deportability and undocumentedness have developed ties to Finland, e.g. through social networks, Finnish or Swedish language fluency, studies or work (ibid.: 20; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2022b: 14). The phenomenon of undocumentedness has grown increasingly complex, including people in different positions and of various genders and ages (Katisko *et al.*, 2023: ibid.). I suggest that this heterogeneity of groups can also be seen as an illustration of the growing abundance of paths towards undocumentedness. At the moment, in Finland, there are many ways for a person to become undocumented. This suggests that, in recent years, it may have also become relatively easier to lose a permit.

People who arrived in Finland seeking asylum and who never received international protection form one of the most visible groups among undocumented people (Katisko *et al.*, 2023: 20). Individuals in these situations are particularly visible among those suspected of intending to circumvent the Finnish immigration law according to the Aliens Act section 36, moment 2 (Human Rights Centre, 2023: 33, 40). The function of this subsection of the Aliens Act is to protect Finland's public interest; however, such public interest remains partly indefinite in the law and in the authorities' interpretations (ibid.: 56), and the subsection on the circumvention of the legislation can be used as one of the reasons to deny residence permits. Migri and the courts have been found to apply this subsection to people in a variety of situations; thus, the scope of their interpretations is seemingly broader than that provided by the quite vague and open text of this subsection (ibid.: 10, 52; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023). Quite often, such restrictive interpretations are based on the belief that the applicant for the permit specifically intended to circumvent and abuse Finnish laws; however, it can sometimes be challenging to ascertain an applicant's intention or (lack of) knowledge about the immigration rules (Human Rights Centre, 2023: 53). Eventually, these interpretations bar many undocumented people and rejected asylum seekers from officialising their status in Finland, even in cases in which the applicant fulfils all the permit requirements (ibid.: 54).

Thus, I argue that some of the interpretations of Migri and the courts label people permanently and solely as undocumented or as rejected asylum seekers. My argument here resonates with the broader observation of how migration categories, and hence interpretations, permit types and the navigation of these processes by individuals, produce migration futures (Raghuram, 2021: 10). These people live their multiple subjectivities in Finland, they may have built ties to their new country

through work, studies, family, and so on. However, their subjectivities as "undocumented people" and "rejected asylum seekers" are singled out, separated from any other possible subjectivities and placed at the centre of their history.

Coupled with the increased risk of falling in between permit categories and the challenges of receiving the alien's passport (see previously 4.1.1.), such law and interpretations force many people towards deportation or undocumentedness. Essentially, the current immigration regime "steals" and "wastes" years of time during which many people have built their lives in Finland (Bhatia and Canning, 2021: xix; Wiik, Skogman and Bäckman, 2019). Policy discourses may seem to prioritise employment for immigrants and refugees as well as fluency in the national languages (Finnish Government, 2015: 38) and professional training accompanied by active participation in Finnish society (Finnish Government, 2019: 139); however, Finland may actually be dismissing the activity, knowledge and ties that people with a refugee background may have developed, unless such activity, knowledge and ties are translated into a valid residence permit (Könönen, 2018: 66). These state practices can send people "back to square one" (Khosravi, 2019) and deprive them of their history – interestingly, *ahistoricity* is also one of the features characterising the narratives of deportations of people who have previously held a permit in Finland (Pirkkalainen, Lyytinen and Pellander, 2022: 8; Tervonen, 2022: 34).

This is one process of labelling that, together with many other people, I have observed through research and activism in the past seven years. The proliferation of legal statuses – common to many countries including Finland – produces different subjectivities in relation to the state (Könönen, 2018: 56). The Finnish immigration system obliges people seeking permits, including people with a refugee background, to pick only one of their multiple identities and to abide by it for years, if they want to access and maintain a residence permit. By doing so, I argue, the residence permit system produces segregated subjectivities, by which a person can retain their permit by being mostly, if not only, one thing at a time, while other subjectivities are given limited space and time (Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021:10). For example, the subjectivity of a "vulnerable person" can be crucial to retaining one's refugee status. For example, the first work permit is built and dependent on the subjectivity of the worker employed in a specific job which is exempted from labour market testing[9] - it is not built and dependent on other jobs, skills or aspirations; the continuation of a marriage is emphasised in people's lives as the prerequisite for accessing and retaining a permit based on family ties, and so on.

---

[9]   While regulating the supply of labour, the residence permit system and the labour market testing contribute to the stratification of labour, restricting work permit holders' mobility in the Finnish labour market (Könönen, 2018: 62).

Often, the subjectivity upholding the permit is prioritised at the expense of other subjectivities (Raghuram, 2021: 11), both in the law and in the everyday life of the permit holder. To be able to retain their permit, people invest time, space and other resources into the said subjectivity for long periods, often for years. Thus, the segregation of subjectivities becomes materialised and embodied in a variety of ways. For instance, a work permit is only granted for specific jobs (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023f)[10]; a student permit allows its holders to work for a maximum of thirty hours per week on average (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023h; on the administrative border struggles and temporalities of student permit holders, see Maury, 2022); a person holding an entrepreneur permit must work in their own enterprise and cannot change their permit for one based for example on a Finnish professional degree without renouncing their position in the enterprise (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023g[11]; Private communication with a lawyer, 2022), and so on. This may result in many people being trapped in "permit tunnels", with the permit demanding much from its holder's everyday life and dreams, present and future, and, sometime, from their networks of family and friends (Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1548; The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023: 29).

Many people spend years of their life navigating different permit categories, striving to access or maintain their permit and not to be deported. To do so, they often have to adapt their behaviour on a daily basis and to "translate their lives into juridical language" (Könönen, 2018: 58). Furthermore, the subjectivities produced by the residence permit system also expose people to the risk of exploitation by their partners and employers; or, sometimes, these people possibly become surveillant agents for the state (ibid.: 64). Thus, permit seekers and holders may or may not make certain life choices, which are not necessarily reflected in the residence permit system. If their life circumstances or plans change, some may have to take their lives beyond the "legal obstacles" of a new permit, thus crossing yet another border (The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023: 13).

---

10   At least in the case of a person's first permit, "[the permit holder] can only work in the professional field to which [their] job belongs and for which [they] have been granted a residence permit. [They] may have several jobs in the same professional field" (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023f). If a person had a continuous residence permit (A-type) for at least one year, then they can apply for a worker's permit based on any job, meaning that they are exempted from the labour market testing. Still, if their first permit was based on work, they cannot simply apply for a new job: they should also apply for a new worker's permit, because their first worker's permit is bond to the specific job for which the permit was granted.

11   "If you have been granted a residence permit for an entrepreneur, there are no limits on your right to work in Finland. However, you must earn your living primarily from your business, as a residence permit for an entrepreneur is issued for engaging in business activities" (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023g).

Some people with a refugee background might struggle to change the grounds of their permit. Due to the rigidity of the Finnish residence permit system and the interpretations which tend to label people, they may fail to meet all the requirements for a new permit. In 2023, even the then Ministry of the Interior recognised that the current permit system is rigid, slow, bureaucratic, that permit processes are complicated and that moving between permits is challenging (The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023: 29). The Ministry also highlighted the need to create new bases for permits – despite the numerous permit categories existing in the Finnish law –, with a view to make changes from one permit to another smoother (ibid.). It remains unclear what other permit grounds could be recognised and what possibilities are available for permit holders to move between different permit categories following possible changes in their life circumstances.

Thus, in the current situation, instead of being a means to enabling life in Finland, the permit can sometimes become the end, the aim towards which a person makes and invests time, space, relationships, income, and more. As in the case of the temporalities linked to passports and global mobilities (4.1.1.), I argue that also in these cases there is a risk of idolatry (Ovadia, 2008: 99): there is a risk of exchanging the means for the end, if the lives of people seeking and holding permits are made to revolve around the residence permit system. The production of segregated subjectivities limits and sometimes subverts not only the thinking on migration and permit categories, but also people's agency (Raghuram, 2021: 13).

Isolating and prioritising only some subjectivities of people with a refugee background is a form of dehumanisation, as it deprives these people of the multiplicity of subjectivities common to every human being. Thus, my research argues for recognising the agencies and knowledges of people with a refugee background beyond the subjectivities prioritised in the Aliens Act (see also **Article II**: 119). This said, it should be remembered that, in some particular struggles and contexts, "the invocation of a singular category is *the* political point" (Raghuram, 2021: 19). Thus, people navigating permits and deportability may sometimes mobilise as solely "refugees", "workers", "rejected asylum seekers", and so on. In such cases, their voices and acts can congregate and humanise migration categories, thus subverting the power of the state.

Here I have provided some examples of how the asylum and immigration system shapes the lives of people navigating it by affecting their subjectivities and uses of time and space. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that the lives of people seeking asylum and permits involve much more than migration processes and permit categories, more than their "here and now", more than their being "asylum seekers" and/or "workers", "family members", "students", and other subjectivities linked with residence permits (**Article III**; Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1557).

People with a refugee background may experience a lack of or a restriction of their mobilities due the thresholds in the law[12] and in their everyday spaces (such as racism and denial of online banking credentials). Nonetheless, this does not mean they may not mobilise. Indeed, their "navigations through the spatio-temporal contexts of [refugeehood] might create openings for new political orientations" (Khosravi, 2021: 206), from the more structured and organised to the more informal and everyday (Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021).

For instance, despite deportability, in Finland people with a refugee background may find safety from the violence they initially fled and that they experienced during their journeys. They may focus on studying, working, volunteering, taking care of themselves, their families and other significant ones (**Article II**, **Article III**) or participating in informal integration (**Article I**). They may resist, organise, protest and perform acts of citizenship of various kinds (for instance, see Stop Deportations, n.d., and Refugee Radio, n.d.).

Lastly, my fieldwork and analysis have highlighted spaces where the temporalities of leisure, family life and work can sometimes blur into each other. Some of these spaces, such as malleable spaces for work, leisure and in-between temporalities (e.g. libraries, NGO premises, shops and cafés), seem to allow people to live their multiple subjectivities simultaneously (**Article I**).

However, this does not mean that such spaces should be normalised. While it is important to acknowledge and attend to the capacity of people to create material and social spaces that work well for them, remaking physical spaces alone may not necessarily improve the experiences of people with a refugee background. Writing about people seeking asylum and living in reception centres, Thorshaug and Brun emphasise the *throwntogetherness* of the material, legal, institutional and lived experiences (Thorshaug and Brun, 2019: 245): the interaction between these various elements, can indeed maintain the production of temporal injustice, just like the Finnish permit system, various kinds of racism and other borderings experienced by people with a refugee background.

Through this thesis I have learned the importance of allowing socially separate spaces based on e.g. gender, race, ethnicity or sexuality. Such spaces can offer safety from racism, sexism and other oppressive norms. Moreover, they help people retain contact with their own cultures and languages; such spaces can allow people to enjoy their own time and, at least temporarily, to open presents which are free from the pressures of assimilation, work, family, refugeehood and of their struggles to rebuild their life (**Article I**: 98, 101).

---

[12] For an analysis of the temporalities produced by the German and Italian asylum systems and their administrative barriers, see also Fontanari, 2017: 47.

To conclude, I hope this discussion contributes to calls "to recognise and support the plurality of futures people envision for themselves, and that are practiced and produced as people live their lives in a web of spatiotemporal [power] relations" (Drangsland, 2021: 83). In what follows, I continue on the themes of segregation and multiple subjectivities, this time concentrating on geographers and researchers in general.

4.3 Methodological implications

Research question 3: What are the methodological implications of the present thesis and research process?

Based on this thesis process, I will now show how time and temporalities are crucial not only to the agencies of people with a refugee background, but also to ethics and the practice of geography. Some geographers have been segregating academic research from activism, theory from praxis, knowing from doing, and their subjectivity as researchers from their subjectivity as humans (see methodological chapter, 3.2.2.). In what follows, I illustrate the findings of my research in the methodological dimension.

When examining or otherwise engaging with the temporalities of national immigration regimes and of the people navigating them, it is crucial that researchers make their analytical labour of disentanglement visible and explicit (Drangsland, 2021: 85–86; see earlier in discussion, 4.1.1.). When discussing integration processes, permit applications, possible solutions and futures, we simultaneously envelop other futures in the time defined by the state and its own interests (ibid.: 86). During the time of working on this thesis, I have observed the need for such a labour of disentanglement not only among researchers, but also among activists and allies in general. In all of our subjectivities, we all need to resist national temporalities and stay focused on the humanity, interests and times of various people with a refugee background (**Article III**).

For instance, deportation is feared by many and is a crucial event in which the state accelerates the temporalities of people with a refugee background and their supporters (Meier and Donà, 2021: 55). Deportability, indeed, "forms a common horizon for all third country nationals without a permanent residence permit" (Könönen, 2018: 58). While supporting people with a refugee background in their struggle to avoid deportation, one needs to stay focused on any other priority that these people may have. If we focus only on avoiding deportation by any means possible, the person at risk of deportation and their supporters may be forced to accept unwanted consequences and to embrace futures that they did not wish for. These paths may push them adrift from their previous priorities for years and from the lives that they had been building for themselves until that moment.

Therefore, the plurality of temporalities, the heterogeneity of times fused with one another (Drangsland, 2021: 86), can imply that the temporalities of a person may sometimes conflict with each other. Nevertheless, there are no possibilities (as yet) outside the national migration regime (**Article III**). Without intending to belittle the agencies of people with a refugee background, global, EU and national migration regimes often propose to people with a refugee background inhumane choices, and thus must be challenged and resisted.

During my thesis, I have witnessed and lived the tensions generated, on one side, by doing with what the present offers and following the futures offered by the state and, on the other side, by creating alternative presents and futures. I recognise that, while I have lived the temporalities of deportability-related research and activism as a nearly constant emergency, a politics of immediacy, of "here and now", activism in its various forms has been important to me to give a sense of agency, to find empathy, to collectively make potential futures possible or at least imaginable and to practice radical hope (Chatterton, 2008: 420; Kallio, Meier and Häkli, 2021; Maynard, 2018: 210).

I have also lived and witnessed another asynchrony, or "temporal problem": people with a refugee background and those acting with and for them often navigate temporal horizons which involve immediate problems, demand immediate solutions and immediate impact – in addition to the longer-term temporal horizons of their struggles. Such immediacy is often at odds with the time it takes to carry out research and disseminate results (Lancione, 2017: 997).

As an activist, together with others navigating asylum and deportability we have faced, among other things, urgency, emergencies and crisis. As a researcher, I have experienced that the knowledge we produced is sometimes slow and "out of sync" compared to the ever-changing field of migration control (Jacobsen and Karlsen, 2021: 15).

4.3.1 Segregating research from activism: complying with nationalism?

Throughout this thesis, I have observed a similarity between the processes through which the state segregates the subjectivities of people with a refugee background and the dynamics which segregate the subjectivities of geographers. The present discussion highlights how the epistemological, methodological and political aspects of these processes are necessarily interwoven (Raghuram, 2021: 10).

Two factors have played a crucial role in shaping my methodology as well as my politics in everyday life. One is human encounters and the other the need to be accountable to people with a refugeehood background. Both have been important when navigating racism, asylum, undocumentedness and deportability as a

researcher, an activist and a human in my everyday life (Di Feliciantonio, 2017; Fuller and Askins, 2010: 665; **Article III**). Over the years, I have been actively creating occasions in which to encounter people with a refugee background and to learn about their priorities; in other words, I tried to put myself in the right place at the right time (Fuller and Askins, 2010: 666). With this combination of academic, activist and everyday personal practice, I have striven to sustain political communication and tackle the segregating dynamics that could thwart such communication (Young, 1999).

Through my work, I have striven to re-centre the everyday life and human subjectivity of people with a refugee background and researchers alike. These fundamental, intimate dimensions are an integral part of our work as geographers. The deliberate, unpunished exclusion of people seeking refuge and safety from society has made any possible distinction between global geopolitics and embodied everyday life untenable (Gökarıksel *et al.*, 2021: 17). Furthermore, it is in the intimacies of everyday life and care that state power is contested and reproduced (Jacobsen, 2023: 1310).

In this thesis, I have suggested that, as geographers and academics in general, we should recognise that we are implicated, as humans through everyday life and as scholars through research work, in the national temporalities of immigration and in the risk of reproducing methodological nationalism (Abdelnour and Abu Moghli, 2021; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002; **Article III**). By researching and writing, we are "constituted by and constitutive of the state" (Mountz, 2002: 191). Our subjectivities and practices, namely how we position ourselves in relation to temporal continuums of violence (Gökarıksel *et al.*, 2021: 14), can impact the lives of people seeking asylum or navigating deportability in various ways, from reinforcing the national and interpersonal politics that produce privilege and oppression, to supporting the agencies of people with a refugee background and resisting with them (**Article III**; Datta, 2019: 1107).

Further, we need to recognise the position that universities and the other institutions we participate in occupy in the structures that oppress the lives of people with a refugee background. Thus, we must stay alert to the individualising processes of neoliberal academia (Brankamp and Weima, 2021: 2) – which, similar to national immigration and integration regimes, create individualised subjectivities for people with a refugee background (see the previous sections of this chapter, 4.2.1.).

Through my research and activism, I have endeavoured to pursue "a marriage" between my academic and activist roles, so that my private and professional subjectivities and practices would not be segregated from each other through space and time (Fuller and Kitchin, 2004: 6). I have endeavoured not only to practice reflexivity – individually and interactively (Kohl and McCutcheon, 2015) –, but also to show the embeddedness of every researcher in the phenomena they study as a

human. I have proposed a way to move beyond "giving back" and to place research at the service of those involved in social struggles, of the people navigating racism and deportability in various ways (**Article III**; Derickson and Routledge, 2015: 1; Mackenzie, McDowell and Pittaway, 2007).

Based on this thesis, I argue that, when the tools that academia conventionally offers are irrelevant or insufficient for activists (Hopkins, 2021: 388), then we as researchers need to be ready to embrace other practices (**Article III**; Lyytinen, 2022: 4). Example of such other practices in which I have been involved consist mainly of everyday care, political lobbying and lay assistance in legal cases. As researchers, we need to be honest, challenge our own assumptions about the power of academics and recognise when we should not conduct research at all (Derickson and Routledge, 2015: 5). Further, "we need to let our core values … and feelings directly inform our research. This is informed by both personal political values and the need to engage with our emotional responses to the world around us" (ibid.: 3). Feelings are meaningful, a proximity to pathos can allow situated solidarities to emerge and people in collaboration to produce meaning (Vasudevan, 2021: 37). Grappling with emotions is a question of both academic rigour and of fundamental humanity (Askins and Swanson, 2019: 4).

This thesis introduction and **Article III** also serve to recognise where my knowledge on the topics that I research comes from – and where it is directed. Through human encounters and various forms of care – everyday, political, legal –, I have learned about the "micro-geographies … of legal spaces, practices and procedures" which can weigh significantly in the everyday lives of people with a refugee background (Jacobsen, 2021: 596). Simultaneously, while performing feminist legal praxis, I have endeavoured to honour the other subjectivities and priorities of people with a refugee background; hence the need for everyday care and "just being", also as a form of resistance to the pervasive temporalities of deportability and permits (**Article III**).

Moreover, it is through these encounters and practices that I have learned about the multiplicity of issues at stakes in the lives of people with a refugee background and that I have become the person that I am now. It would be impossible and pointless to separate what I have learned from these people and the person I have now become (**Article III**). As Moss wrote (2014: 805): "I was not the same as who I was when I started …, nor could I be that person again". Somehow, I also experienced a form of re-subjectification (Mountz, 2011: 386); who I am acquired new meanings for me as a human, and thus as a researcher. This re-subjectification has highlighted to me the co-constitutiveness of citizenship and refugeehood (Kapur, 2007), the responsibilities that we have to each other as fellow human beings and the limits of every individual's agency. Subsequently, "I [started relating] to knowledge,

knowledge production, my understanding of self, and the people I encountered in the world around me differently" (Moss, 2014: 805).

Fuller and Askins ask what the role of a researcher is in contexts where praxis at time requires other practices than those currently possible and endorsed by academia, and where people who are not professional geographers or academics can also be seen as practising critical geography (Fuller and Askins, 2010: 666; Blomley, 2008: 287). I do not have a definite answer to this question – and maybe there is no answer. On the basis of this research, I believe that being a professional geographer and a researcher provides one more subjectivity which can be mobilised in struggles for social justice.

To conclude, embracing one's subjectivity as a researcher, an activist and a human being can sometimes be challenging and uncomfortable. At times, it may constrain an individual's agency or marginalise researchers-and-activists within their discipline, universities, departments or research groups. Sometimes, these processes can cause careers to be curtailed. Despite this, many people understand the value and necessity of being, thinking and acting as researchers-and-activists, activist scholars, activist/academics, and so on (Fuller and Kitchin, 2004: 9). By connecting and organising actions (Activist Research Network, n.d.), through collaborations and care, we can provide present and future researchers-and-activists with space, time and support, hopefully making academia a more care-full, humane and just place for all.

5   Conclusions

In this thesis and in my doctoral research, I have pursued two main objectives. First, I have aimed to contribute scientific knowledge about the broad topic of everyday agencies and temporalities among people with a refugee background across legal statuses. I have done so through the empirical analysis of different dimensions of their everyday life, specifically leisure, citizenship and, through citizenship, integration, education, employment and family life. To better understand the temporalities of people who navigate asylum, permits, deportability and undocumentedness, I have built on the idea of citizenship and refugeehood as mutually constitutive (Kapur, 2007). I have conceptualised citizenship and refugeehood as the two sides of a spatio-temporal continuum along which people with a refugee background – but, I suggest, everybody, also people with no migration or refugee background – position themselves, shift, accelerate, get stuck, experience advancements and setbacks at different times or simultaneously in different spaces of their everyday life.

Second, I have aimed at contributing to collective efforts to re-centre the lives and humanity of people with a refugee background *vis à vis* the tyranny of residence permits and passports. My analysis has been committed to amplifying the voices, agencies and practices of resistance of various people with a refugee background, both the research participants and others. Drawing from discussions on ethics in forced-migration research and from critical and feminist geographies, I have striven to emplace myself in the topic that I have researched, to highlight my own embeddedness in it and to better understand my responsibilities towards people with a refugee background. With a view to re-centring researchers' humanity in academic work, in Article III and in this thesis, I have suggested the possibilities for geographers and other researchers to act with and for people with a refugee background, to challenge methodological nationalism and oppressive immigration policies.

In what follows, I summarise the results of this research by addressing the three research questions that I have presented in the thesis introduction. Subsequently, I illustrate the key contributions and limitations of this thesis and give suggestions for

further research. Lastly, I reflect briefly on the current context and the changes underway.

Research Question 1: What are the common priorities and temporalities along the refugeehood-citizenship continuum among people with a refugee background?

My research shows that people with a refugee background practise political agency regardless of their legal status. Their agencies may be variously supported or constrained both before officialising their status in Finland and after even accessing the so-called universal realm of Finnish citizenship (Ambrosini, 2012).

Among the main priorities of the people with a refugee background that I have interviewed was the goal of obtaining a Finnish residence permit and Finnish citizenship. Many of the research participants saw the Finnish passport as a means of enabling "normal" life as well as global and local mobilities. However, people with a refugee background may simultaneously pursue other priorities, for example studying, becoming employed, taking care of their families in Finland and/or elsewhere. My research has identified racism as one of the factors which can restrict the spatio-temporal agencies of people with a refugee background regardless of their status – as it is the case for racialised Finns who may not identify with refugeehood experiences at all.

I have argued that the Finnish immigration system prioritises the passports of the attributed country of origin of people with a refugee background over the lives of these people. I have defined this phenomenon as "the idolatry of passports" (Ovadia, 2008: 99). Thus, at times, the system places more value on identity documents, permits and passports, rather than on the years-long residence of these people in Finland. Based on the passport requirement for residence permit applicants set forth in the Aliens Act, integrated individuals and families may be forced into deportability and undocumentedness only because they lack the passport of their attributed country of origin (Pirjatanniemi *et al.*, 2021). In these cases, Finland transforms the passport from a means into an end, nullifies the years lived in Finland abiding by the law and wastes the integration of people seeking permits. By doing so, the state also wastes the resources that Finland itself and many of its residents of various backgrounds may have invested in the lives of people seeking permits.

My research has shown the ambivalence of family dynamics and of the positioning of a person in the family, as well as of the spatio-temporalities of employment regulated by the law and residence permit categories. Taking care of one's family and becoming employed is important to many people with a refugee background: the achievement of such priorities may shift them towards the citizenship side of the continuum. However, family and employment may also restrict the agencies of these people in some regards, depending on the situation (Kallio, 2019; Kynsilehto, 2011b).

Research Questions 2: From a theoretical point of view, what do these temporalities imply for the integration and subjectivities of migrants in Finland?

My research joins the literature which challenges the linear temporalities of integration (Nyers, 2013). By attending to the experiences and priorities of people navigating integration themselves, we can better understand how integration may occur thanks to the input of many individuals, in various languages, places, times and power relations. My research emphasises that, for those navigating it, integration may not always be orientated towards creating Finnish-speaking employable individuals, but towards more open-ended futurities and multilingual collectivities of knowledge and care. Therefore, my analysis confirms the importance of exposing whose temporalities are examined in research (Drangsland, 2021). In addition, the results of my work touch on the sometimes invisible integration labour done by families, associations, religious communities, networks of friends, volunteers and others.

Combining the knowledge that I have derived from my research, everyday encounters and activism, I have envisaged how the Finnish immigration system tends to segregate the subjectivities of people with a refugee background and of people seeking or holding permits in general (Könönen, 2018; Raghuram, 2021). The linear temporalities of integration and the segregating processes enacted by the state reduce people navigating permits – and people with a refugee background in particular – to one single subjectivity, inducing them to abide to this subjectivity for years.

Thus, it can be said that the right to create liveable futures for oneself and one's close ones is unevenly distributed (Drangsland, 2021: 90). The segregation of subjectivities perpetrated by the state is dehumanising as it deprives people of their human complexity and of their pasts, presents and futures. Moreover, such segregation has concrete consequences in their everyday life, as it can affect the emotions, dreams, presents and futures of the people navigating asylum and permits. Furthermore, it can affect these people's communities, in Finland and beyond – family members, friends, employers, colleagues and other significant individuals (Pirkkalainen, Näre and Lyytinen, 2022).

Research Question 3: What are the methodological implications of this research for geographers and researchers in general?

Similar to the segregating processes enacted by the Finnish immigration system, I have observed how some geographers and other scholars may confine their subjectivities as researchers to the times and spaces of Finnish academia, segregating them from their own humanity. In this thesis, I have argued for the recognition of how our knowledge and practices as researchers are influenced by our own experiences as individuals. Further, I have underlined the necessity and possibilities to embrace any practice that we can enact wherever we may be at as humans in order to support fellow humans struggling for justice (Maxey, 1999). This sometimes

requires us as researchers to move beyond the traditional academic practices, such as writing papers.

The de-segregation of subjectivities – and thus of practices – could benefit research. More importantly, by de-segregating, research could better serve struggles for social justice and contribute to making the world – and academia – a better place by producing more caring humans (Cahill, Sultana and Pain, 2007). In this regard, the key questions include who sets the research agenda, what questions are asked, and whether research can contribute an impact in the times and spaces that those directly concerned define as relevant.

As to the contributions of this thesis, I believe that my work has enriched analyses of everyday temporalities among people with a refugee background. By raising their voices and illuminating their agencies, I have striven to support the complexity of their humanity in its various subjectivities (Brankamp and Weima, 2021: 5). In this way, I have added to discussions about the mismatches between categorical thinking and the complexities of individual lives in migration (Kynsilehto, 2011b: 1557). My texts have contributed to critical inquiries into segregation and integration. I hope that, with my analysis, I have managed to expose, at least partly, the racialised and nativist privilege of citizenship. One novelty of my work is that I have combined discussions on ethics, relevance and advocacy from forced-migration research with discussions about critical praxis and activism from critical and feminist geographies.

Simultaneously, this thesis has some limitations. I feel the research would have benefitted from a more comprehensive intersectional approach throughout the doctoral process, from planning the research to writing this thesis. Throughout the process, I have been striving for a more intersectional approach to better understand the differences among people with a refugee background, between me and each of them, and to better grasp how we make sense of those differences, of ourselves and of each other. I also recognise the limitations of my data: however, through open discussion with the research participants and with peers, constant reflection and substantial participant observation, I have done my best to overcome some of these limitations. I recognise that more creative and inclusive methods could have been used; what I did was the best that I could do considering my learning process, the gradual consolidation of trust between me and the research participants and the resources we had at our disposal (e.g. time and language interpretation).

Considering all this, I would suggest that future research could explore the priorities of various people across legal status in a truly intersectional and 'de-migranticising spirit' (Dahinden, 2016). Moreover, a specific study combining the analysis of people's experiences and of the residence permit system would be needed to reveal how the Finnish immigration law and its interpretations influence the subjectivities of people navigating asylum and permits, and how these people resist,

navigate and experience such production of subjectivities. More research is needed to understand what other grounds could be created for permits and recognised by Finland and what possibilities there are for permit holders to move between different permit categories. As to integration, it would be interesting to see more scientific work highlighting the variety of actors "doing integration" across a multiplicity of times, spaces and languages; such works could make explicit whose temporalities, definitions and practices of integration are at play from time to time.

To conclude, during the time that I have been writing this synopsis, some significant changes and processes have been underway in Finland regarding undocumentedness, asylum and residence permits. In April 2023, a right-wing government won the elections: many parties have been talking of immigration in ways that reproduce exclusionary, hierarchising and differencing imaginaries of migrants. In late 2022–early 2023, there had been some improvements and promising developments, such as discussions about the comprehensive reform of the Aliens Act (The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior, 2023) and closer scrutiny of Migri's decision making and interpretations (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023b). However, the situation of people affected by the recent production of undocumentedness remains unresolved and the current government's proposals take Finland's immigration policy to an extremely restrictive, hostile direction.

Here are just a few of the changes that the current right-wing government is aiming to implement, based on their government programme from 2023: tightening the asylum policy by applying more stringent provisions with regard to the processing of asylum applications and asylum recognition rates (Finnish Government, 2023: 220); increasing returns and deportations of rejected asylum seekers (ibid.); cutting the annual refugee quota from 1,050 to 500 individuals (Finnish Immigration Service, 2023a; Finnish Government, 2023: 220); making international protection temporary in nature and shortening the length of international protection permits to the minimum allowed by EU law (Finnish Government, 2023: ibid.); preventing asylum seekers from entering Finland and having their asylum applications handled and decided at the national border (ibid.: 221); preventing rejected asylum applicants from applying for a work permit (ibid.: 222); repealing the previous government's reform which granted necessary health care to all people living in undocumentedness (ibid.: 223); extending the required period of residence for Finnish permanent permits and citizenship (ibid.: 225).

What will become of the lives of people with a refugee background, those seeking permits, and those caring for them? I nurture my hope for human rights for everybody and I wish that an increasing number of people will join those of us demanding justice and safety for all the people navigating refugeehood, at all times and in every place.

Last but not least, I hope that together, as researchers, activists and humans, we can find new or develop the existing ways of doing research which is based on the vast knowledge of people variously navigating asylum and deportability, with a view to placing the practice and outcomes of research to the service of collective efforts for social justice.

List of References

Abdelnour, S., and Abu Moghli, M. (2021). Researching violent contexts: A call for political reflexivity. *Organization* 0(0): 1–24.

Activist Research Network. (n.d.). *Activist Research Network.* <https://mailman.abo.fi/mailman/listinfo/activist-research-network> Accessed 20.10.2021.

Adams, T. E., and Herrmann, A. F. (2023). Good autoethnography. *Journal of Autoethnography* 4(1): 1–9.

Ahmad, A. (2020). When the name matters: An experimental investigation of ethnic discrimination in the Finnish labor market. *Sociological Inquiry* 90(3): 468–496.

Ahonen, T., and Kallius, A. (2019). Paperittomuuden tuotanto ja hallinta Suomessa vuosina 2015–2017. In E. Lyytinen (Ed.), *Turvapaikanhaku ja pakolaisuus Suomessa* (pp. 89–112). Siirtolaisuusinstituutti.

Alatrash, G. (2018). On understanding the experience of Syrian refugees through an autoethnographic lens. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 50(3): 131–143.

Alderman, D. H., and Inwood. J. F. J. (2019). The need for public intellectuals in the Trump era and beyond: Strategies for communication, engagement, and advocacy. *The Professional Geographer* 71(1): 145–151.

Alho, R. (2021). Finland: Integration of asylum seekers and refugees in a tightened policy framework. In B. Galgóczi (Ed.), *Betwixt and between: Integrating refugees into the EU labour market* (pp. 83–107). European Trade Union Institute Etui.

Ali, R. (2015). Rethinking representation: Negotiating positionality, power and space in the field. *Gender, Place & Culture* 22(6): 783–800.

Aliens Act, Pub. L. No. 301/2004; amendments up to 1163/2019 included (2004). <https://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2004/en20040301.pdf>

Al-Sharmani, M. (2007). *Contemporary migration and transnational families: The case of Somali diaspora(s)*. The American University in Cairo, Egypt. <http://schools.aucegypt.edu/GAPP/cmrs/Documents/MulkiAlsharmani.pdf>

Ambrosini, M. (2012). Between national States and cosmopolitan societies: The institution of citizenship takes the immigration test. *Migraciones* 31: 11–41.

Amnesty International. (2023). *Mitä Marinin hallituksen turvapaikkapolitiikasta jäi käteen?* <https://www.amnesty.fi/mita-marinin-hallituksen-turvapaikkapolitiikasta-jai-kateen/> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Anderson, B. (2021). Epilogue. In M. Bhatia and V. Canning (Eds.), *Stealing Time: Migration, Temporalities and State Violence* (pp. 223–227). Springer International Publishing.

Askins, K., and Swanson, K. (2019). Holding onto emotions: A call to action in academia. *Emotion, Space and Society* (33): 1–5.

Asylum-Network. (2015). Guest editorial: Interventions in migration and activism. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 14(2): 442–451.

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. (2012). *Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies.*

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies AIATSIS. (2022). *AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research* <https://aiatsis.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-10/aiatsis-code-ethics.pdf>

Axelsson, L., Malmberg, B., and Zhang, Q. (2017). On waiting, work-time and imagined futures: Theorising temporal precariousness among Chinese chefs in Sweden's restaurant industry. *Geoforum* 78: 169–178.

Bassel, L. (2008). Citizenship as interpellation: Refugee women and the State. *Government and Opposition* 43(2): 293–314.

Bejarano, C., and Hernández Sánchez, M. E. (2023). Geographies of friendship and embodiments of radical violence, collective rage, and radical love at the U.S.–Mexico border's Paso del Norte region. *Gender, Place & Culture* 30(7): 1012–1034.

Bengle, T., and Schuch, C. (2018). Integrating participatory action research into graduate geography studies: A tale of two dissertations. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 42(4): 617–629.

Bhatia, M., and Canning, V. (Eds.). (2021). *Stealing Time. Migration, Temporalities and State Violence*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69897-3>

Birkvad, S. R. (2019). Immigrant meanings of citizenship: Mobility, stability, and recognition. *Citizenship Studies* 23(8): 798–814.

Blomley, N. (2006). Uncritical critical geography? *Progress in Human Geography* 30(1): 87–94.

Blomley, N. (2008). The spaces of critical geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 32(2): 285–293.

Bodström, E. (2023). The extraordinary: Asylum process as an intertextual chain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 49(9): 2454–2471.

Bolt, G., Sule Özüekren, A., and Phillips, D. (2010). Linking integration and residential segregation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(2): 169–186.

Brankamp, H., and Weima, Y. (2021). Introduction: Humanizing studies of refuge and displacement? *Refuge* 37(2): 1–10.

Browne, K., Banerjea, N., McGlynn, N., Sumita, S., Bakshi, L., Banerjee, R., and Biswas, R. (2017). Towards transnational feminist queer methodologies. *Gender, Place and Culture* 24(10): 1376–1397.

Browne, K., Brown, G., and Nash, C. J. (2021). Geography and sexuality II: Homonormativity and heteroactivism. *Progress in Human Geography* 45(5): 1320–1328.

Butz, D., and Besio, K. (2009). Autoethnography. *Geography Compass* 3(5): 1660–1674.

Cahill, C. (2007). The personal is political: Developing new subjectivities through participatory action research. *Gender, Place and Culture* 14(3): 267–292.

Cahill, C., Sultana, F., and Pain, R. (2007). Participatory ethics: Politics, practices, institutions. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 6(3): 304–318.

Chatterton, P. (2008). Using geography to teach freedom and defiance: Lessons in social change from 'Autonomous Geographies'. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 32(3): 419–440.

Chick, G. (1998). Leisure and culture: Issues for an anthropology of leisure. *Leisure Sciences* 20(2): 111–133.

Cinnamon, J. (2020). Power in numbers/Power and numbers: Gentle data activism as strategic collaboration. *Area*. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12622

Clark-Kazak, C. (2021). Ethics in forced migration research: Taking stock and potential ways forward. *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 9(3): 125–138.

Collins, F. L. (2021). Geographies of migration I: Platform migration. *Progress in Human Geography* 45(4): 866–877. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520973445>

Crang, M. (2003). Rhythms of the city: Temporalised space and motion. In J. May and N. Thrift (Eds.), *Timespace: Geographies of temporality* (pp. 187–207). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203360675-14>

Cuomo, D. (2021). Practising feminist politics in legal geographic research. *Area* 53(4): 562–568.

Cwerner, S. B. (2001). The times of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27(1): 7–36.

Dahinden, J. (2016). A plea for the 'de-migranticization' of research on migration and integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39(13): 2207–2225.

Datta, A. (2019). 'But this is not geography…! of ontological circumcisions and writing feminist geographies from India. *Gender, Place and Culture* 26(7–9): 1103–1110.

De Genova, N. P. (2002). Migrant 'illegality' and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 419–447.

De Genova, N., Tazzioli, M., Aradau, C., Bhandar, B., Bojadzijev, M., Cisneros, J. D., et al. (2021). Minor keywords of political theory: Migration as a critical standpoint. A collaborative project of collective writing. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 40(4): 781–875.

Derickson, K. D., and Routledge, P. (2015). Resourcing scholar-activism: Collaboration, transformation, and the production of knowledge. *Professional Geographer* 67(1): 1–7.

Dickinson, J., Andrucki, M. J., Rawlins, E., Hale, D., and Cook, V. (2008). Introduction: Geographies of everyday citizenship. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 7(2): 100–112.

Di Feliciantonio, C. (2017). Queering Communia: The politics of positionality when doing research on squatting in Rome. *Gender, Place and Culture* 24(3): 426–437.

Drangsland, K. A. (2021). Mo's challenge: Waiting and the question of methodological nationalism. In C. M. Jacobsen, M.-A. Karlsen and S. Khosravi (Eds.), *Waiting and the temporalities of irregular migration* (pp. 75–95). Routledge.

Esposito, F., Murtaza, A., Peano, I., and Vacchiano, F. (2020). Fragmented citizenship: Contemporary infrastructures of mobility containment along two migratory routes. *Citizenship Studies* 24(5): 1–17.

Every Woman's Centre. (n.d.). *Every Woman's Centre.* <https://www.facebook.com/kaikkiennaistentalo> Accessed 15.8.2021.

Faria, C., Klosterkamp, S., Torres, R. M., and Walenta, J. (2020). Embodied exhibits: Toward a feminist geographic courtroom ethnography. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 110(4): 1095–1113.

Farrer, G. L. (2004). The Chinese social dance party in Tokyo: Identity and status in an immigrant leisure subculture. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 33(6): 651–674.

Feldman, I. (2016). Reaction, experimentation, and refusal: Palestinian refugees confront the future. *History and Anthropology* 27(4): 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2016.1201482>

Fetterman, D. M. (2009). Ethnography. In L. Bikman and D. J. Rog (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods* (2nd ed.) (pp. 543–588). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483348858>

Finnish Government. (2015). *Finland, a land of solutions. Strategic programme of Prime Minister Juha Sipilä's Government.* Government Publications 2015:12. <https://valtioneuvosto.fi/documents/10184/1427398/Ratkaisujen+Suomi_EN_YHDISTETTY_netti.pdf/8d2e1a66-e24a-4073-8303-ee3127fbfcac>

Finnish Government. (2019). *Inclusive and competent Finland. A socially, economically and ecologically sustainable society.* Publications of the Finnish Government 2019:33. <https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/161935/VN_2019_33.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Finnish Government. (2022). Key aim of the Integration Act reform is to speed up integration and employment of immigrants. <https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/-/1410877/key-aim-of-the-integration-act-reform-is-to-speed-up-integration-and-employment-of-immigrants-> Accessed 13.3.2023.

Finnish Government. (2023). *A strong and committed Finland. Programme of Prime Minister Petteri Orpo's Government.* Publications of the Finnish Government 2023:60.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023a). Asylum in Finland. Quota refugees. <https://migri.fi/en/quota-refugees#:~:text=In%202021%2C%20the%20number%20was,to%20Finland%20as%20quota%20refugees> Accessed 4.8.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023b). *Erillisvalvonta vuonna 2022 tehtyihin kielteisiin jatko-oleskelulupapäätöksiin.*
<https://migri.fi/documents/5202425/5701276/Selvitys_Erillisvalvonta+vuonna+2022+tehtyihin+kielteisiin+jatko-oleskelulupapäätöksiin.pdf/58253d56-9836-c318-a9a7-493921f49d6f/Selvitys_Erillisvalvonta+vuonna+2022+tehtyihin+kielteisiin+jatko-oleskelulupapäätöksiin.pdf?t=1681802273606> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023c). Finnish citizenship. Means of support. <https://migri.fi/en/citizenship-application/means-of-support> Accessed 15.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023d). Finnish citizenship. Period of residence. <https://migri.fi/en/period-of-residence> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023e). Residence permit. Permanent residence permit application. <https://migri.fi/en/application-for-a-permanent-residence-permit#:~:text=You%20can%20get%20a%20permanent,uninterrupted%20period%20of%20four%20years> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023f). Residence permit. Residence permit application for an employed person (TTOL). <https://migri.fi/en/residence-permit-for-an-employed-person> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023g). Residence permit. Residence permit application for an entrepreneur. <https://migri.fi/en/entrepreneur> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023h). Residence permit. Studying in Finland. <https://migri.fi/en/studying-in-finland> Accessed 3.5.2023.

Finnish Immigration Service. (2023i). Statistics. Asylum applications 1/2015 – 12/2015. <https://tilastot.migri.fi/index.html#applications/23330/49?l=en&start=540&end=551> Accessed 28.7.2023.

Fontanari, E. (2017). It's my life: The temporalities of refugees and asylum-seekers within the European border regime. *Etnografia e Ricerca Qualitativa* 1: 25–54. <https://doi.org/10.3240/86886>

FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2017). *Second European Union minorities and discrimination survey. Main results*. <https://doi.org/10.2811/902610>

Free Movement Network. (n.d.). *Free Movement Network*. https://www.facebook.com/vapaaliikkuvuus/about. Accessed 1.2.2022.

Fuller, D., and Askins, K. (2010). Public geographies II: Being organic. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(5): 654–667.

Fuller, D., and Kitchin, R. (2004). *Radical Theory/Critical Praxis: Making a Difference beyond the Academy?* Praxis (e)Press.

Gawlewicz, A., and Sotkasiira, T. (2020). Revisiting geographies of temporalities: The significance of time in migrant responses to Brexit. *Population, Space and Place* 26: 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2275>

Gill, N., and Hynes, J. (2021). Courtwatching: Visibility, publicness, witnessing, and embodiment in legal activism. *Area* 53(4): 569–576.

Gill, N., Hoellerer, N., Allsopp, J., Burridge, A., Fisher, D., Griffiths, M., Hambly, J., Paszkiewicz, N., Rotter, R., and Vianelli, L. (2022). Rethinking commonality in refugee status determination in Europe: Legal geographies of asylum appeals. *Political Geography* 98: 1–11.

Gökarıksel, B., Hawkins, M., Neubert, C., and Smith, S. (2021). Introduction. In B. Gökarıksel, M. Hawkins, C. Neubert, and S. Smith (Eds.), *Feminist geography unbound: Discomfort, bodies, and prefigured futures* (pp. 1–24). West Virginia University Press.

Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watts, M., and Whatmore, S. (Eds.). (2009). Subject/Subjectivity. In *The dictionary of human geography*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Griffin, P. (2018). Making usable pasts: Collaboration, labour and activism in the archive. *Area* 50(4): 501–508.

Haji Molana, H. (2019). Silent voices: Notes from a young Muslim woman on acculturation in the United States. *Emotion, Space and Society* 33: 1–4.

Halstead, F., Parsons, L. R., Dunhill, A., and Parsons, K. (2021). A journey of emotions from a young environmental activist. *Area* 53(4): 708–717.

Heikkilä, E., and Lyytinen, E. (2019). Irakilaistaustaisten pakolaisten työelämään integraation ajallisuus. In E. Lyytinen (Ed.), *Turvapaikanhaku ja pakolaisuus Suomessa* (pp. 321–344). Siirtolaisuusinstituutti.

Herbert, J. (2021). The socio-ecological imagination: Young environmental activists constructing transformation in an era of crisis. *Area* 53(2): 373–380.

Ho, E. L. E. (2021). Social geography I: Time and temporality. *Progress in Human Geography* 45(6): 1668–1677.

hooks, b. (1990). Homeplace: A site of resistance. *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics*. South End Press.

Hopkins, P. (2021). Social geography III: Committing to social justice. *Progress in Human Geography* 45(2): 382–393.

Horsti, K. (2017). *Unjust to everyone?: Responses to deportartion of asylum seekers in Finland*. Open Democracy. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/injustice-to-everyone-moral-responses-to-deportation-of-asylum-seekers-in-finland/>

Horton, J. (2021). For diffident geographies and modest activisms: Questioning the ANYTHING-BUT-GENTLE academy. *Area* 00: 1–7. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi/10.1111/area.12610>

Hughes, S. M. (2021). 'Wait for a permanent contract': The temporal politics of (in)fertility as an early career researcher. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 39(8): 1725–1736. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654421994852>

Human Rights Centre. (2023). *Report on the case law on circumvention of entry provisions*. Ihmisoikeuskeskuksen julkaisuja 2023:2.

Hyndman, J., and Giles, W. (2011). Waiting for what? The feminization of asylum in protracted situations. *Gender, Place and Culture* 18(3): 361–379.

Ismail, A. A. (2016). Somali children in Finland are raised by their mothers. *Afrikan Sarvi* 2. <http://afrikansarvi.fi/issue12/128-artikkeli/328-somali-children-in-finland-are-raised-by-their-mothers>

Jacobsen, C. M., and Karlsen, M.-A. (2021). Introduction: Unpacking the temporalities of irregular migration. In C. M. Jacobsen, M.-A. Karlsen and S. Khosravi (Eds.), *Waiting and the Temporalities of Irregular Migration* (pp. 1–19). Routledge.

Jacobsen, C. M., Karlsen, M.-A, and S. Khosravi (Eds.). (2021). *Waiting and the Temporalities of Irregular Migration*. Routledge.

Jacobsen, K., and Landau, L. B. (2003). The dual imperative in refugee research: Some methodological and ethical considerations in social science research on forced migration. *Disasters* 27(3): 185–206.

Jacobsen, M. H. (2021). Practical engagements in legal geography: Collaborative feminist approaches to immigration advocacy in Denmark. *Area* 53(4): 595–602.

Jacobsen, M. H. (2022). Precarious (dis)placement: Temporality and the legal rewriting of refugee protection in Denmark. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 112(3): 819–827. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2021.1999199>

Jacobsen, M. H. (2023). A feminist geopolitics of living: Syrians' struggles to maintain and reunite intimate ties across borders. *Gender, Place & Culture* 30(9): 1303–1324.

Jacobsen, M. H., and Gilmartin, M. (2021). The ethics and politics of migration research. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 11(1): 69-72.

Jenkins, K. (2017). Women anti-mining activists' narratives of everyday resistance in the Andes: Staying put and carrying on in Peru and Ecuador. *Gender, Place and Culture* 24(10): 1441–1459.

Johnston, L. (2017). Gender and sexuality II: Activism. *Progress in Human Geography* 41(5): 648–656.

Juniu, S. (2000). The impact of immigration: Leisure experience in the lives of South American Immigrants. *Journal of Leisure Research* 32(3): 358–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2000.11949921>

Järvenpää, M., Kallio, K.-M., Kallio, T., and Rautiainen, A. (2021). The chain of control in results based management in Finnish universities. In Z. Hoque (Ed.), *Public Sector Reform and Performance Management in Developed Economies: Outcomes-Based Approaches in Practice* (pp. 177–192). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003004080-9-12>

Kakil, R. (n.d.). *Dreams*. <https://rewankakil.myportfolio.com/dreams>

Kaleva, V., and Himanen, M. (2019). Lessons from solidarity work with migrants to the post–2015 asylum and migration debate. *Migration-Muuttoliike* 45(1): 16–18.

Kallio, K.-M., Kallio T. J., and Grossi, G. (2017). Performance measurement in universities: Ambiguities in the use of quality versus quantity in performance indicators. *Public Money & Management* 37(4): 293–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2017.1295735>

Kallio, K. P. (2019). Leading refugee lives together: Familial agency as a political capacity. *Emotion, Space and Society* 32: 1–8. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi/10.1016/j.emospa.2018.08.002>

Kallio, K. P., Meier, I., and Häkli, J. (2021). Radical hope in asylum seeking: Political agency beyond linear temporality. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 47(17): 4006–4022.

Kallio, K. P., and Mitchell, K. (2016). Introduction to the special issue on transnational lived citizenship. *Global Networks* 16(3): 259–267.

Kapur, R. (2007). The citizen and the migrant: Postcolonial anxieties, law, and the politics of exclusion/inclusion. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 8(2): 537–569.

Katisko, M., Annala, I., Kalm-Akubardia, M., Kynsilehto, A., Marucco, C., Pehkonen-Elmi, T., and Viljanen, K. (2023). *Paperittomien henkilöiden sosiaaliset oikeudet Suomessa*. Valtioneuvoston kanslia.

Keskinen, S. (2016). From welfare nationalism to welfare chauvinism: Economic rhetoric, the welfare state and changing asylum policies in Finland. *Critical Social Policy* 36(3): 352–370.

Keskinen, S., Atabong Alemanji, A., Himanen, M., Kivijärvi, A., Osazee, U., Pöyhölä, N., and Rousku, V. (2018). *The stopped – Ethnic profiling in Finland*. SSKH Notat Svenska social- och kommunalhögskolan vid Helsingfors universitet 2018:1.

Khé, S. (2019). Will it play in Peoria? *The Professional Geographer* 71(1): 167–171.

Khosravi, S. (2019). What do we see if we look at the border from the other side? *Social Anthropology* 27(3): 409–424.

Khosravi, S. (2021). Afterword. Waiting, a state of consciousness. In C. M. Jacobsen, M.-A. Karlsen and S. Khosravi (Eds.), *Waiting and the Temporalities of Irregular Migration* (pp. 202–207). Routledge.

Kinkaid, E., Parikh, A., and Ranjbar, A. M. (2022). Coming of age in a straight white man's geography: reflections on positionality and relationality as feminist anti-oppressive praxis. *Gender, Place & Culture* 29(11):1556–1571.

Kitchin, R. (2019). The timescape of smart cities. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 109(3): 775–790. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2018.1497475>

Kitchin, R. M., and Hubbard, P. J. (1999). Research, action and 'critical' geographies. *Area* 31(3): 195–198.

Klocker, N. (2012). Doing Participatory action research and doing a PhD: Words of encouragement for prospective students. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 36(1): 149–163.

Kohl, E., and McCutcheon, P. (2015). Kitchen table reflexivity: Negotiating positionality through everyday talk. *Gender, Place and Culture* 22(6): 747–763.

Könönen, J. (2018). Differential inclusion of non-citizens in a universalistic welfare state. *Citizenship Studies* 22(1): 53–69.

Kynsilehto, A. (2011a). *The Politics of Multivocality. Encountering Maghrebi Women in France*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Tampere.

Kynsilehto, A. (2011b). Negotiating intersectionality in highly educated migrant Maghrebi women's life stories. *Environment and Planning A* 43(7): 1547–1561.

Kynsilehto, A. (2014). *Introducing forced voluntary return: New prospects for becoming irregular in Finland*. Rights in Exile. <https://rightsinexile.tumblr.com/post/87519885022/introducing-forced-voluntary-return-new>

Kynsilehto, A. (2017). Mobilities, politics, and solidarities. *Peace Review* 29(1): 48–54.

Kynsilehto, A. (2018). Solidarities in migration. In M. Karakoulaki, L. Southgate, J. Steiner (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Migration in the Twenty–First Century* (pp. 181–195). E-IR Edited Colledtions.

Kynsilehto, A. (2022). Forced displacement crisis amidst the war in Ukraine. *Alusta! Tampereen yliopiston yhteiskuntatieteiden tiedekunnan verkkojulkaisu.* <https://www.tuni.fi/alustalehti/2022/04/12/forced-displacement-crisis-amidst-the-war-in-ukraine/>

Laakkonen, V. (2022). Deaths, disappearances, borders: Migrant disappearability as a technology of deterrence. *Political Geography* 99. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi/10.1016/j.polgeo.2022.102767>

Lancione, M. (2017). The ethnographic novel as activist mode of existence: Translating the field with homeless people and beyond. *Social and Cultural Geography* 18(7): 994–1015.

Leinonen, J., Lyytinen, E., Tiilikainen, M., and Kmak, M. (2020). Ethics of studying forced migration: Critical questions to consider. *Liikkeessä Yli Rajojen*. <https://liikkeessaylirajojen.fi/ethics-of-studying-forced-migration-critical-questions-to-consider/>

Leitner, H., and Ehrkamp, P. (2006). Transnationalism and migrants' imaginings of citizenship. *Environment and Planning A* 38(9): 1615–1632.

Leppäkorpi, M. (2022). *In Search of a Normal Life. An Ethnography of Migrant Irregularity in Northern Europe*. Doctoral dissertation. Publications of the University of Eastern Finland.

Lister, R. (2007). Inclusive citizenship: Realizing the potential. *Citizenship Studies* 11(1): 49–61.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider*. Crossing Press.

Lupa Elää. (2021). *Lupa elää – Permit to live*. <https://lupaelaa.fi/in-english/#:~:text=Lupa%20el%C3%A4%C3%A4%20%2D%20Permit%20to%20Live,been%20issued%20continuous%20residence%20permits> Accessed 1.2.2022.

Lyytinen, E. (Ed.) (2019). *Turvapaikanhaku ja pakolaisuus Suomessa*. Siirtolaisuusinstituutti.

Lyytinen, E. (2022). Revisiting the 'dual imperative' of forced-migration studies: Commentary to Refstie. *Fennia* 200(1): 74–77.

Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C., and Pittaway, E. (2007). Beyond 'do no harm': The challenge of constructing ethical relationships in refugee research. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20(2): 299–319.

Madikizela-Madiya, N. (2023). Transforming higher education spaces through ethical research publication: A critique of the publish or perish aphorism. *Higher Education Research & Development* 42(1): 186–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2048634>

Majamaa, K., Nieminen, K., Lepola, O., Rantala, K., Jauhola, L., Karinen, R., Luukkonen, T., and Kortelainen, J. (2019). *Kohti laadukkaita oikeusapupalveluita*. Valtioneuvoston kanslia.

Manes-Rossi, F., Mussari, R. and Cepiku, D. (2022). Introduction to the special issue: Performance measurement systems in universities: Threats or opportunities for governance? *Journal of Management and Governance* 26: 327–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-022-09638-5>

Marucco, C. (2017). Turvapaikanhakijoiden arkipäivä. In J. S. Jauhiainen (Ed.), *Turvapaikka Suomesta? Vuoden 2015 turvapaikanhakijat ja turvapaikkaprosessit Suomessa* (pp. 85–101). Publications of the department of geography and geology of the University of Turku.

Marucco, C. (2018). *Finnish Somali women: Defining and living citizenship in Turku*. Research Briefings 4b/2018. The City of Turku – Kaupunkitutkimusohjelma.

Marucco, C. (2021). Tutkijuus ja yhteiskunnallinen vaikuttavuus vaativat tilaa ihmisyydelle. *Versus Tiededbatti, Kriisitutkimus Muutosvoimana*. <https://www.versuslehti.fi/tiededebatti/kriisitutkimus-muutosvoimana/>

Maury, O. (2021). *Punctuated Lives: Student-Migrant-Workers' Encounters with the Temporal Border Regime*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki.

Maury, O. (2022). Ambivalent strategies: Student-migrant-workers' efforts at challenging administrative bordering. *Sociology* 56(2): 369–385.

Maxey, I. (1999). Beyond boundaries? Activism, academia, reflexivity and research. *Area* 31(3): 199–208.

Maxey, L. J. (2004). Moving beyond from within: Reflexive activism and critical geographies. In D. Fuller and R. Kitchin (Eds.), *Radical Theory/Critical Praxis: Making a Difference beyond the Academy?* (pp. 159–171). Praxis (e)Press.

Mayblin, L. (2014). Colonialism, decolonisation, and the right to be human: Britain and the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 27(3): 423–441.

Maynard, N. (2018). Activism across the lifecourse: Circumstantial, dormant and embedded activisms. *Area* 50(2): 205–212.

Meier, I. (2020). Affective border violence: Mapping everyday asylum precarities across different spaces and temporalities. *Emotion, Space and Society* 37.

Meier, I., and Donà, G. (2021). Micropolitics of time: Asylum regimes, temporalities and everyday forms of power. In M. Bhatia and V. Canning (Eds.), *Stealing Time. Migration, Temporalities and State Violence* (pp. 39–64). Springer International Publishing.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. (n.d.). *Somalia: Travel documents to Finland.* <https://um.fi/visa-requirement-and-travel-documents-accepted-by-finland/-/asset_publisher/Obdz8bMcFgrI/content/somalia-matkustusasiakirjat-suomeen/385107?_com_liferay_asset_publisher_web_portlet_AssetPublisherPortlet_INSTANCE_Obdz8bMcFgrI_assetEntryId=432776> Accessed 20.5.2023.

Mitchell, K. (2023). Migration, memory, and the insurgent temporalities of sanctuary. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 105(2): 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04353684.2022.2150672>

Mitchell, K., Jones, R., and Fluri, J. (2019). Introduction to the handbook on critical geographies of migration. In K. Mitchell, R. Jones and J. L. Fluri (Eds.), *Handbook on Critical Geographies of Migration* (pp. 1–16). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Morrison, C. A., Woodbury, E., Johnston, L., and Longhurst, R. (2022). Everyday activisms: Parental places and emotions of disability activism in Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand. *Area* 54(1): 126–134.

Moss, P. (Ed.). (2001). *Placing Autobiography in Geography*. Syracuse University Press.

Moss, P. (2004). A 'politics of local politics': Praxis in places that matter. In D. Fuller and R. Kitchin (Eds.), *Radical Theory/Critical Praxis: Making a Difference beyond the Academy* (pp. 103–115). Praxis (e)Press.

Moss, P. (2014). Some rhizomatic recollections of a feminist geographer: Working toward an affirmative politics. *Gender, Place and Culture* 21(7): 803–812.

Moss, P., and Besio, K. (2019). AutomMethods in feminist geography. *GeoHumanities* 5(2): 313–325.

Mountz, A. (2002). Feminist politics, immigration, and academic identities. *Gender, Place and Culture* 9(2): 187–194.

Mountz, A. (2011). Where asylum-seekers wait: Feminist counter-topographies of sites between states. *Gender, Place and Culture* 18(3): 381–399.

Mulíček, O., Osman, R., and Seidenglanz, D. (2016). Time–space rhythms of the city: The industrial and postindustrial Brno. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 48(1): 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15594809>

Nakamura, N. (2015). What is a community's desire? A critical look at participatory research projects with Indigenous communities. *Social and Cultural Geography* 16(2): 165–182.

Näre, L., Bendixsen, S., and Maury, O. (2022). Creating a future while waiting for a residence permit: Temporary and irregular migrants in informal social infrastructures. *European Journal of Social Work* <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2022.2135092>

Näre, L., and Jokela, M. (2023). The affective infrastructure of a protest camp: Asylum seekers' 'Right to Live' movement. *Sociological Review* 71(1): 165–182.

Nyers, P. (2013). Liberating irregularity.: No borders, temporality, citizenship. In J. Huysmans and X. Guillaume (Eds.), *Citizenship and Security: The Constitution of Political Being* (pp. 37–52). Routledge.

Oberhauser, A. M., and Caretta, M. A. (2019). Mentoring early career women geographers in the neoliberal academy: Dialogue, reflexivity, and ethics of care. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 101(1): 56–67.

Ovadia, M. (2008). *Vai a te stesso*. Einaudi Stile Libero.

Page, B., Christou, A., and Mavroudi, E. (2017). Introduction: From time to timespace and forward to time again in migration studies. In E. Mavroudi, B. Page, and A. Christou (Eds.), *Timespace and International Migration* (pp. 1–16). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pain, R. (2003). Social geography: On action-orientated research. *Progress in Human Geography* 27(5): 649–657.

Pain, R., Finn, M., Bouveng, R., and Ngobe, G. (2013). Productive tensions: Engaging geography students in participatory action research with communities. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 37(1): 28–43.

Painter, J., and Philo, C. (1995). Spaces of citizenship: An introduction. *Political Geography* 14(2): 107–120.

Papoutsi, A. (2021). Temporal bordering in the space of the camp: Producing and contesting abandonment in Skaramagas and Elaionas camps in Athens. *Political Geography* 89: 102423.

Pascucci, E. (2016). Transnational disruptions: Materialities and temporalities of transnational citizenship among Somali refugees in Cairo. *Global Networks* 16(3): 326–343.

Pascucci, E. (2019). The humanitarian infrastructure and the question of over-research: Reflections on fieldwork in the refugee crises in the Middle East and North Africa. *Area* 49(2): 249–255.

Penttinen, E., and Kynsilehto, A. (2017). *Gender and Mobility: A Critical Introduction*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Petäjäniemi, M., Lanas, M., and Kaukko, M. (2021). How to be a 'good asylum seeker'? The subjectification of young men seeking asylum. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 11(3): 284–300.

Phillips, D. (2006). Parallel lives? Challenging discourses of British Muslim self segregation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24(1): 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d60j>

Pirjatanniemi, E., Lilja, I., Helminen, M., Vainio, K., Lepola, O., and Alvesalo-Kuusi, A. (2021). *Ulkomaalaislain ja sen soveltamiskäytännön muutosten yhteisvaikutukset kansainvälistä suojelua hakeneiden ja saaneiden asemaan*. Valtioneuvoston kanslia.

Pirkkalainen, P., Lyytinen, E., and Pellander, S. (Eds.). (2022). *Suomesta poistetut. Näkökulmia karkotuksiin ja käännytyksiin*. Vastapaino. <https://doi.org/10.58181/vp9789517689960>

Pirkkalainen, P., Näre, L., and Lyytinen, E. (2022). 'I do not trust any of them anymore': Institutional distrust and corrective practices in pro-asylum activism in Finland. *Current Sociology.* <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921221129313>

Pottinger, L. (2017). Planting the seeds of a quiet activism. *Area* 49(2): 215–222.

Pottinger, L. (2020). Treading carefully through tomatoes: Embodying a gentle methodological approach. *Area*. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12650

Private communication with a lawyer. (2022).

Raghuram, P. (2021). Democratizing, stretching, entangling, transversing: Four moves for reshaping migration categories. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies* 19(1): 9–24.

Ramadan, A. (2013). Spatialising the refugee camp. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38(1): 65–77.

Rask, S., Elo, I. T., Koskinen, S., Lilja, E., Koponen, P., and Castaneda, A. E. (2018). The association between discrimination and health: Findings on Russian, Somali and Kurdish origin populations in Finland. *European Journal of Public Health* 28(5): 898–903.

Rastas, A. (2004). Am I still 'white'? Dealing with the colour trouble. *Balayi: Culture, Law and Colonialism* 6.
<https://trepo.tuni.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/67975/am_i_still_white_2004.pdf?sequence=1>

Rastas, A. (2013). Ethnic identities and transnational subjectivities. In P. Spickard (Ed.), *Multiple identities. Migrants, ethnicity, and membership* (pp. 41–60). Indiana University Press.

Refstie, H. (2021). Reconfiguring research relevance: Steps towards salvaging the radical potential of the co-productive turn in searching for sustainable solutions. *Fennia – International Journal of Geography* 199(2): 159–173.

Refugee Radio. (n.d.). *Refugee Radio Fi.* <https://www.facebook.com/refugeeradioFi> Accessed 1.9.2022.

Reynolds, K., Block, D., and Bradley, K. (2018). Food justice scholar-activism and activist-scholarship: Working beyond dichotomies to deepen social justice praxis. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 17(4): 98–998.

Robertson, S. (2014). Time and temporary migration: The case of temporary graduate workers and working holiday makers in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(12): 1915–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.876896>

Rodrigo, F. (2021). Ex-centric citizenship: Bolivian migration and violence in Argentina. *Citizenship Studies* 25(3): 389–408.

Routledge, P. (2004). Relational ethics of struggle. In D. Fuller and R. Kitchin (Eds.), *Radical Theory/Critical Praxis: Making a Difference beyond the Academy?* (pp. 79–91) Praxis (e)Press.

Russell, B. (2015). Beyond activism/academia: Militant research and the radical climate and climate justice movement(s). *Area* 47(3): 222–229.

Saarikkomäki, E., Oljakka, N., Vanto. Johanna, Pirjatanniemi, E., Lavapuro, J., and Alvesalo-Kuusi, A. (2018). *Kansainvälistä suojelua koskevat päätökset Maahanmuuttovirastossa 2015–2017. Pilottitutkimus 18–34-vuotiaita Irakin kansalaisia koskevista myönteisistä ja kielteisistä päätöksistä.* Oikeustieteellisen tiedekunnan tutkimusraportteja ja katsauksia 2018:1.

Sartoretto, P., and Custódio, L. (2020). Dealing with ethical dilemmas in activist research on social movement media. In S. Jeppesen and P. Sartoretto (Eds.), *Media Activist Research Ethics: Global Approaches to Negotiating Power in Social Justice Research* (pp. 51–66). Palgrave Macmillan.

Scheller, M. (2019). Afterword: Time is of the essence. *Current Sociology* 67(2): 334–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392118792919>

Schmidt, A. (2007). 'I know what you're doing', reflexivity and methods in Refugee Studies. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 26(3): 82–99.

Shannon, J., Hankins, K. B., Shelton, T., Bosse, A. J., Scott, D., Block, D., Fischer, H., Eaves, L. T. E., Jung, J. K., Robinson, J., Solís, P., Pearsall, H., Rees, A., and Nicolas, A. (2021). Community geography: Toward a disciplinary framework. *Progress in Human Geography* 45(5): 1147–1168.

Sircar, S. (2022). Emplacing intersectionality: Autoethnographic reflections on intersectionality as geographic method. *Gender, Place and Culture* 29(7): 903–922.

Spracklen, K., Long, J., and Hylton, K. (2015). Leisure opportunities and new migrant communities: Challenging the contribution of sport. *Leisure Studies* 34(1): 114–129.

Staeheli, L. A., Ehrkamp, P., Leitner, H., and Nagel, C. R. (2012). Dreaming the ordinary: Daily life and the complex geographies of citizenship. *Progress in Human Geography* 36(5): 628–644.

Staeheli, L. A., and Lawson, V. A. (1995). Feminism, praxis, and human geography. *Geographical Analysis* 27: 321–338.

Stop Deportations. (n.d.). *Stop Deportations.* <https://www.facebook.com/SeisKarkotuksille> Accessed 1.8.2022.

Support for Asylum Seekers. (n.d.). *Support for Asylum Seekers.* <https://www.turvapaikanhakijoidentuki.fi/en/home-2/> Accessed 1.6.2022.

Taylor, M. (2014). 'Being useful' after the ivory tower: Combining research and activism with the Brixton Pound. *Area* 46(3): 305–312.

Te Kloeze, J. W. (2001). Integration through leisure? Leisure time activities and the integration of Turkish families in two cities in the Netherlands. In J. L. L. Anderson (Ed.), *Gender Issues in Work and Leisure* (pp. 51–61). Leisure Studies Association.

Tefera, G. W., and Gamlen, A. (2023). Temporal logics in urban place–making: The case of refugee-background Ethiopians in Australia. *Urban Geography* 44(1): 243–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2021.1975993>

Tervonen, M. (2022). Näkökulmia karkotuksiin historiallisena tutkimuskohteena. In P. Pirkkalainen, E. Lyytinen and S. Pellander (Eds.), *Suomesta poistetut. Näkökulmia karkotuksiin ja käännytyksiin* (pp. 31–49). Vastapaino.

Tervonen, M., Pellander, S., and Yuval-Davis, N. (2018). Everyday bordering in the Nordic countries. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 8(3): 139.

The Finnish Refugee Advice Centre. (n.d.). *The Finnish Refugee Advice Centre*. <https://www.pakolaisneuvonta.fi/en/> Accessed 15.1.2022.

The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior. (2022a). *Report on the travel document requirement and the issue of alien's passports*. <https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/163826/SM_2022_15.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior. (2022b). *Report on possible national solutions to the situation of people without a right of stay in Finland*. <https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/163827/SM_2022_16.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

The Migration Department of the Ministry of the Interior. (2023). *Perspectives on the Comprehensive Reform of the Aliens Act*. <https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/164810/SM_2023_17.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Thorshaug, R. Ø., and Brun, C. (2019). Temporal injustice and re-orientations in asylum reception centres in Norway: Towards critical geographies of architecture in the institution. *Fennia* 197(2): 232–248.

Thrift, N. (1981). Owners' time and own time. In T. Hägerstrand and A. Pred (Eds.), *Space and Time in Geography: Essays Dedicated to Torsten Hägerstrand* (pp. 56–84). Lund Series in Geography B 48.

Todd, J. D. (2021). Experiencing and embodying anxiety in spaces of academia and social research. *Gender, Place & Culture* 28(4): 475–496.

Torres, R. M. (2019). Everyday encounters with activist scholarship. *The Professional Geographer* 71(1): 161–166.

Torres, R. M., Glockner, V., Niño-Vega, N., García-Figueroa, G., Faria, C., Danze, A., Borzacchiello, E., and Slack, J. (2022). Lockdown and the list: Mexican refugees, asylum denial, and the feminist geopolitics of esperar (waiting/hoping). *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 0(0): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544221118906>

Țîștea, I. (2020). 'Reflexivity of reflexivity' with Roma-related Nordic educational research. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education* 4(1): 26–42.

United Nations. (2022). *UNHCR chief condemns 'discrimination, violence and racism' against some fleeing Ukraine*. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2022/03/1114282> Accessed 10.1.2023.

Vasudevan, P. (2021). Brown scholar, black studies: On suffering, witness, and materialist relationality. In B. Gökarıksel, M. Hawkins, C. Neubert, and S. Smith (Eds.), *Feminist Geography Unbound: Discomfort, Bodies, and Prefigured Futures* (pp. 27–47). West Virginia University Press.

Vuolteenaho, J., and Lyytinen, E. (2018). Reflections on the variations and spatialities of (un)welcome: Commentary to Gill. *Fennia* 196(1): 118–123.

Wall, S. (2008). Easier said than done: Writing an autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 7(1): 38–53.

Watkins, J. (2020). Irregular migration, borders, and the moral geographies of migration management. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 38(6): 1108–1127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654420915607>

Wesche, S., Huynh, N. T., Nelson, E., and Ramachandran, L. (2010). Challenges and opportunities in cross-cultural geographic inquiry. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 34(1): 59–75.

Weima, Y., and Minca, C. (2022). Closing camps. *Progress in Human Geography* 46(2): 261–281.

We See You. (n.d.). *We See You*. <https://www.facebook.com/weseeyoucampaign/> Accessed 1.8.2021.

Wiik, J., Skogman, S., and Bäckman, L. (Eds.). (2019). *We See You. Berättelser och vittnesmål*. Schildts & Söderström.

Wimmer, A., and Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–334.

Wolf, O., Brown, J., Leddy-Owen, C., and Martin, D. (2023). Making space for solidarity: The transformative role of shame in challenging racialised hegemony. *Area* 55(1): 108–115.

Wood, A. (2015). Multiple temporalities of policy circulation: Gradual, repetitive and delayed processes of BRT adoption in South African cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39: 568–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12216>

Wood, L., Swanson, K., and Colley. D. E. III. (2020). Tenets for a radical care ethics in geography. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 19(2): 424–447.

Young, I. M. (1999). Residential segregation and differentiated citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 3(2): 237–252.