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Integration policies reflect a certain vision of nationhood, of who should legitimately take part in the national society and how such inclusion must be achieved. Theoretical and political redefinitions of the term have taken place in response to the new dynamics associated to the state-context, international migration and an apparent convergence among European countries. The perceived homogenization of integration policies might be challenging traditional national paradigms under which countries frame their integration policies. Despite what the new trends suggest the official discourse might still be perceived as a mode of inclusion - unique to a country - by the people that is been affected by integration policies. Academics and politicians rarely take a look at the way in which the citizenry understands integration policies. This paper wishes to contribute to a better understanding of the concept of integration from a bottom-up perspective. The aim is to explore until what extent national discourses frame people’s perceptions of integration and their role as citizens in the national society. The results of this study show that there is still a national imprint in the understanding of integration when examining individuals’ perceptions. In this paper the perception towards integration are analyzed taking into account empirical material collected through survey questions and in-depth interviews. The narratives of people with immigrant ancestry, receptors of integration policies, are compared to the individuals with a native ancestry. The fieldwork took place in countries with a diametrically different approach towards integration and diversity: Sweden and France. The main results show that the national models are far from being disregarded by the citizenry, who tends to describe integration considering traditional models and an emphasis on integration as a right in the case of Sweden and a duty in France.
Introduction

Integration is a political, multidimensional and value-laden concept. Each country obeys to a certain paradigm when including people with a foreign background. Integration policies might be used to give a sign about migration, to configure “future” citizens and re-affirm national identity. That is how one can learn about the model of national citizenship when turning to policies directed to immigrants and their descendants. Integration models have an imprint of the ideal kind of citizen that citizenship regimes depict.

The concept of integration is approached from very different points of departure depending on the national and the institutional context. The perceived homogenization of integration policies towards a civic-integration model might be challenging traditional national paradigms under which countries frame their policies. Most academic work regarding integration is usually centered in policy formulation, political discourse or the philosophical traditions behind immigrant incorporation and national identity. But few, if any, have tried to measure the societal impact of these reforms at the meso- or micro level. There seems to be little or no interest to test whether integration as a concept is understood by citizens in the same manner as in the political discourse. Moreover, the target groups of integration policies are rarely mention as a source of information when disentangling the significance of integration.

The understanding of integration from an individual perspective might reflect to what extent the political discourse finds resonance among citizens and how incorporation measures are perceived by those who are subjects of integration policies. At the same time, individuals might be able to reflect, contest, or vindicate traditional models of citizenship when reviewing the idea of integration. Is the civic turn being reflected by individuals? Does the individual perception about integration reflect models discussed in the literature? This study intends to analyze the idea of integration from a bottom-up approach. Citizens of both immigrant and native ancestry were asked about their understanding of integration in two different contexts: Sweden, a pioneer within multiculturalism that has resisted the trend towards a civic integration approach and France, perhaps the best representative of an assimilationist model that has adopted civic integration strategies since the early 90’s.

With the help of survey data and in-depth interviews this paper shows a different perspective of integration. Individuals expressed their own perceptions, roles and agency within integration. The respondents – of both Survey data and in-depth interviews- are between 18-35 years old living in Paris or Stockholm. The quantitative information was gathered by the TIES Survey¹, a study targeting the so-called second generation immigrants in Europe. The qualitative information is a follow-up of the TIES project, having as respondents a sub-sample of the TIES Survey. A total of 64 interviews were compiled among two groups in two cities. Respondents with a Turkish origin but who were born in France and Sweden respectively and are citizens in these countries were the target group. The control group was composed by respondents with native French or Swedish ancestry. Interestingly, all of the respondents of the in-depth interviews who have Turkish ancestry are dual citizens.

When looking at survey data and in-depth interviews it is possible to observe a discourse about rights and another about duties when discussing integration. Scholars have previously analyzed the tension between rights and duties within integration and citizenship models (Joppke, 2009; Borevi, 2008). The TIES – The Integration of the European Second Generation - survey was carried out by survey bureaus under the supervision of eight research institutes: the Institute for Social and Political Opinion Research [ISPO], University of Leuven, Belgium; the National Institute for Demographic Studies [INED], France; the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies [SFM] Switzerland; the Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations [CEIFO], University of Stockholm, Sweden; the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies [IMIS], University of Osnabruck, Germany; the Institute for European Integration Research [EIF], Centre for the Study of Migration and Citizenship (CEMC); and the Institute of Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES) at the Universiteit van Amsterdam. The TIES project was coordinated by IMES at the Universiteit van Amsterdam. The Dutch Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI) coordinated the international survey in all participating countries.

¹ The TIES – The Integration of the European Second Generation - survey was carried out by survey bureaus under the supervision of eight research institutes: the Institute for Social and Political Opinion Research [ISPO], University of Leuven, Belgium; the National Institute for Demographic Studies [INED], France; the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies [SFM] Switzerland; the Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations [CEIFO], University of Stockholm, Sweden; the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies [IMIS], University of Osnabruck, Germany; the Institute for European Integration Research [EIF], Centre for the Study of Migration and Citizenship (CEMC); and the Institute of Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES) at the Universiteit van Amsterdam. The TIES project was coordinated by IMES at the Universiteit van Amsterdam. The Dutch Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI) coordinated the international survey in all participating countries.
This is an individual approach towards such discussions centered on the perceptions of such models and a possible influence of the civic integration trend over citizens’ perceptions.

**INTEGRATION: THE NOTION, MODELS AND ACTORS**

**CONCEPT AND TYPOLOGIES**

Integration is a term, a group of policies, a social process and a personal decision. Furthermore, integration it is both an individual and a collective process of adapting to the different interests of people and forming a cohesive community. Nevertheless, it is also a body of policies tending to incorporate people of different ethnic origins into the national state. In its most abstract meaning, being integrated presupposes a condition in which the various parts form a unit (Beckman, 2011: 29). The “integration of immigrants”, as the process through which individuals take part in the dominant society they are living in, became a political benchmark and a public philosophy for most Western European states in past decades (Favell, 2001).

Definitions of the concept vary widely among researchers and policymakers. The notion of “integrating” immigrants assumes an already integrated and cohesive society. Such a state of affairs would be in danger due to immigration (Joppke & Morawska, 2002: 3). Even if this “danger” is disregarded in a multicultural society, where everyone is welcome regardless of culture or ethnicity, the “integration of immigrants” carries the presupposition of a clearly delimited, pre-existing native society. In this sense, only immigrants need to integrate. The subject and at the same time the agent of integration is different across countries. While in some countries the immigrants are the ones who need to assimilate into the national society, in others, integration is seeing as a mutual adaptation among the national society and its most diverse elements. Meanwhile in countries denying a migration character, integration is not even desired as a process that completely includes non-nationals into the national society. The foundations of the different conceptions of integration might well be on citizenship conceptions.

There are different strands of integration that are given different priorities in accordance with the paradigms followed in each country. It is necessary to differentiate between various dimensions of integration in order to study and to manage the inclusion of groups not belonging to the majority. Heckman (2005) divides integration into four main areas: structural integration (referring to the inclusion of immigrants and their children into the labour market, educational system, housing system, etc); cultural integration (cognitive, cultural, behavioral and attitudinal changes among people); social integration (the private relationships and group memberships of people) and identificational integration (the sense of belonging and national and ethnic identities). Different countries give priority to different areas of integration in accordance with particular conceptions of nationhood and the type of citizen desired.

**INTEGRATION MODELS AND CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTIONS**

Theoretical discussions have treated conceptions of citizenship and integration policies as part of the same logic. Koopmans (2005) gives national self-understandings and policies an important role as institutional and discursive opportunities and constraints. He develops a model reflecting the cross-national differences in Europe with regard to contention over immigration and cultural diversity. Among the resulting four models, two are relevant for the purposes of this study. Following the steps
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2 This is just one operational and generic definition from among many that I provide for consideration.
of the republican model, the “assimilationist” model is the representation of the “melting pot” archetype. Any individual may be a part of the political community as long as he or she shows a high degree of acceptance of the national values and behaves accordingly. On the other hand, the pluralist model is inclusive in both cultural and legal terms. Access to citizenship and recognition of the right to cultural difference are provided to immigrants and their descendants. Tolerance and faith in the construction of a common future are basic when trying to achieve social cohesion under this approach. While the first describes the French model, the second is close to the Swedish model. This also coincides closely with the integration policies followed by these countries: assimilationist in the case of France and multicultural in the case of Sweden.

Another approach, this time more focused on integration policy options, was developed by Borevi (2010: 23). This model reflects the author’s view of a constant tension between the ethnos and the demos. The general understanding of national identity – ethnos or demos – is confronted with approaches to ethnic-cultural diversity. According to Borevi, civic integration – as in the republican assimilationist French approach – and multiculturalism may have the intention of promoting integration into what is considered to be a “civic” community of citizens. Nevertheless, the practical consequences of these policy models risk leading to an illiberal notion of the nation as an ethnic community (Borevi, 2010: 23).

Figure 1. Ideal-typical integration policy options (Borevi, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active recognition of Ethnic Sub-groups?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General understanding of national identity</td>
<td>Ethnos</td>
<td>Ethnic Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demos</td>
<td>Civic Integration</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tension between the ethnos and the demos is associated not only with integration policies but also with conceptions of nationhood. The fact that people with migrant ancestry are still called second or third generation “immigrants”, though they have never migrated, is only one of the manifestations of the contradictions between inclusion into the demos versus the ethnos.

The main principles of different models of citizenship are transmitted to integration policies. The ways in which states understand citizenship have a direct effect on how integration is regulated and what outcomes are expected. The republican model would emphasize a process of assimilation of national values, traditions and culture in general. Communitarian models take this process as given, and for those that do not belong to the political community, full inclusion is not an alternative. Therefore, the politics of integration tend to provide only primary tools for inclusion into the national society.

European countries offer examples of all these integration policy options. However, in the past two decades, a convergence towards civic integration has been observed (Joppke, 2007). Such convergence, based mostly in an emphasis in individual responsibility within the labour market, liberal principles and stricter conditions for acquiring citizenship and residency, seems to be the beginning of the end for national models of multiculturalism, universalism and assimilationism. Civic integration strategies stress the importance of functional autonomy within the societal context (Goodman, 2010). Through a set of “civic” requirements – courses, tests and contracts – this approach intends to condition immigrants’ access to permanent residency and citizenship. Naturalization is not only seeing as a
reward but also as way to ensure that most of “civic duties” are fulfilled before individuals are granted with citizenship. Civic integration strategies have been adopted by many European countries with different integration traditions, such as The Netherlands, multicultural-oriented in the past, and France, assimilationist by heart. Joppke considers that the civic integration reforms in Europe share a common focus on duties instead of the previous emphasis on rights (Joppke, 2009). Integration is an obligation for those who aspire to a live in a European country and not a right to be included into the national society. Such change in focus might well be a consequence of nationalist demands and worries over the labour market in time of crisis.

INTEGRATION AND THE SECOND GENERATION

By the 1980’s the integration of immigrants in Europe generated a fervent political debate, and researchers were keen to measure the factors that facilitated or hindered the process of integrating people. Academics proposed different terms to help explain integration as a multilevel process. Empirical studies in the 1990’s reformulated many of the traditional views on assimilation and acculturation. It was the second generation that revealed different alternatives to the dynamics suggested by these concepts.

Assimilation has been one of the key terms used by American scholars to describe the process of integration of immigrants and their descendants. Alba and Nee define assimilation as the “decline, and at its endpoint the disappearance, of an ethnic/racial distinction and the cultural and social differences that express it” (Alba and Nee, 1997: 863). An important misconception of assimilation theory is the desirability of the disappearance of ethnic and racial particularities. This is somehow opposed to what multiculturalism promotes. The second generation came to redefine what had been understood as assimilation. First of all, both the first and second generations showed that assimilation may be partial and may occur at different paces. The concept of “segmented assimilation” (Portes and Zhou, 1993) may better reflect the reality of immigrant adaptation, where ethnic niches allow for people to be integrated in structural terms but still maintain their ethnic ties separated from the national community. The persistent ethnic differences across generations, observed particularly among non-European immigrants (Zhou, 1999:197), showed that total assimilation was not a realistic goal in a society of migration.

Instead of adopting a national identification and leaving behind their migrant ancestry, many second generations adopt what has been called by Portes and Rumbaut “reactive ethnicity”, “the rise and reaffirmation of ethnic solidarity and self-consciousness” (2001: 152). According to these authors, the paths chosen towards or against their incorporation into the national mainstream are framed by individual and structural factors (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001: 201). Among the former, education and language skills are important determinants, and family background and place of residence act as the most important structural determinants of the integration path chosen by people with migrant ancestry.

Do people with immigrant parents born in a certain country also need to be integrated into the society? They are not migrants but are sometimes categorized as such. Independently of the classification applied to the target group of this study, they are directly or indirectly related to integration, understood as a process of inclusion as well as specific policies. They are direct witnesses to the integration process of their parents and, to some extent, a product of integration themselves. The degree of involvement with integration policies is questionable. Many of them were born as national citizens and, in accordance with a republican view, are considered nationals, not migrants.
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**BACKGROUND**

**FRANCE**

France is a strongly defined nation, in spite of regional differences. Citizenship policies were until the 90’s very close to *ius soli*. Today French law for naturalisation tries to include different aspects being a combination of *ius sanguini*, *ius soli* and the will of the applicant (Costa-Lascoux, J, 2000).

The meaning of integration is very unique in this republican context. The way people is included into the French society is towards assimilation into national values. Cultural differences and religious identities must be left behind or be relegated to the private sphere in order to become a member of the society (Wieviorka, 1999; Favell, 2001; Itenau, 2005). A benchmark of French republican integration is the promoted laïcité—better translated as secularism—that guides French public life. The separation of religion from state affairs represents one of the pillars of French republicanism, which, of course, became an issue in matters of integration (Bowen: 2007, 12). The struggle and values that made French Republic possible are until today a strong ground to a national sense of social cohesion and permanent referent for policy making.

Secularism was promoted in spite of the growing religious diversity. The *affair de la foulard*, has generated broad discussions regarding the limits of secularism in the French republic. There were problems associated to integration that were not correctly tackled under republican figures. Segregation, ghettoization and impoverished conditions associated to immigrants—especially Maghrebian—became critical in 2005 when the riots in Paris suburbs achieved such magnitude that the government declared state of emergency.

France is a multicultural state from a demographic perspective but does not recognize it, probably due to the strong historical tradition of nation-state. Wieviorka’s was one the firsts in criticize the denial of multiculturalism in France (Wieviorka, 1992; Wiewiora, 1996; Wiewiora, 1997) He has been criticized for questioning the validity of French republicanism as a model and its inadequacy for the current French problems (Martiniello, 1998: 911).

The French model of immigrant integration which rejects any classification by ethnicity, acted as a push factor for the French immersion into the European “civic integration” trend (Joppke, 2007). In 2003, the government launched an integration program based on the *Contracts d’accueil et d’intégration*. Such contracts – consisting of civic and language instruction - are a good illustration of civic integration advances in Europe. In the same line, the *Loi Sarkozy* restricted the access to permanent residence making it dependent of civic requirements such as knowledge of the language and values of the French Republic (Lochak, 2004). As if these measures were not clear enough to emphasize the direction of the French, integration mode, in 2007 Sarkozy’s administration created a new Ministry in charge not only of integration and migration but also national identity and co-development. The emphasis on national identity for migration and integration policies was criticized by several political actors and the public opinion because of its nationalistic and xenophobic overtones (Marthaler, 2008: 382).

**SWEDEN**

From the models and paradigms here presented Sweden is included in a plural spectrum, although there is still an inclination towards the principle of *ius sanguinis* in naturalization matters. Individuals who acquire citizenship by birth must have Swedish citizens as parents. However, the conditions to acquire citizenship are based on residence grounds. The acquisition of Swedish citizenship has always
been regarded as an incentive for integration instead of being the goal of integration. This might well be encouraged by Sweden’s generous welfare state. The “Swedish model” combines universal access to comprehensive welfare services that set the grounds for full employment and economic growth (Sainsbury, 2012). The universalism of Sweden’s welfare state system sets the grounds not only for citizenship but also integration.

Sweden has never been considered a homogenous nation-state (Westin, 1999). This heterogeneity may be regarded as one of the main grounds to follow a multicultural policy since the first regulations related to integration. Previous to 1974, Sweden had no official policy for managing the settlement of migrants. The increasing number of non-Nordic migrants led to an integration policy based on three principles. In 1974, Integration policy in Sweden was based on equality, freedom of choice and partnership. For some researchers (Akpinar, 1988; Ålund, 1997) this policy emphasized difference creating a discourse that defined immigrants in terms of their culture from the beginning. Nevertheless, it was open in the sense that did not required from assimilation into the national values in order to be a part of the society.

In 1985 the recently created Board of Integration developed a new integration program- “The whole Sweden- strategy”- based on language and vocational training, housing, and municipal responsibility to implement these measures. But as a result this program generated social welfare dependency and segregation (Westin, 2006). The program was reformulated in the 1990, under the same three principles but introducing the concept of diversity, as a signal that the process of integration was regarded as a mutual process between immigrants and Swedes. The emphasis in the difference among cultures was changed in a Government bill in 1997, called From immigration policy to integration policy. The point of departure was to consider Swedish society as ethnically and culturally diverse. Integration policies were not directed to specific ethnic groups Individuals were considered as equals and encouraged to support themselves and take part in the society. Integration was considered a process occurring at both individual and community levels (Regeringskansliet, 2002). The new Swedish Integration Board had the ambition to permeate all policy areas.

The Social democrats governments were especially interested in knowing which factors were related to discrimination, which was investigated through different inquiries (an example: De los Reyes and Kamali, 2005). With the arrival of the Moderate party equality came to mean something broader than respect for the different ethnicities living in Sweden. The fight for equity among different gender, age, sexuality and ethnicity were considered as one big objective under the principle of equal opportunities and rights for all those taking part in Swedish society.

Despite a downscaling in the multicultural ambitions between mid-1980’s and 1990’s (Borevi, 2014), Sweden has remained faithful to its multicultural orientation. Although there is a Swedish integration program for immigrants, this does not follow the civic integration trend. Participation in the integration program is voluntary, the content of the program is job-oriented, until recently the program was de-centralised and naturalization is one step more of the program instead of the final goal (Wiesbrok, 2011). Sweden constitutes an outlier to the fashion of civic integration policies in Europe by not having conditioned the access to rights to civic requirements (Borevi, 2014).
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PERCEPTIONS OF INTEGRATION IN SURVEY DATA: RESPONSIBILITY ON INTEGRATION

Perceptions about integration can be measured in different ways. In the TIES Survey there were specific survey questions pointing to the idea of integration. Two of them referred to the responsibility for integration. The respondents were asked to what extent the government and the immigrants themselves have the responsibility in the integration process. This does not necessarily reflect a specific model, but it might emphasize the association of integration with rights or duties. Integration as a duty stresses the role of the immigrant population. Meanwhile, the perception of integration as a right presupposes that national institutions have the responsibility to grant immigrants with the necessary benefits to become integrated in the society.

There is a significant difference in the way integration is conceived by the two countries here studied. Governments tend to promote integration policies according to the national understanding of the term, which might vary in response to different outcomes of such policies perceived among the population. The citizens, with and without immigrant background, might react to integration policies differently, depending on whether they associate integration more with a right than with a duty.

The first question from TIES data delivers information on the role that government and immigrants should have in order to promote integration.

**Figure 2. Government should do more to improve the position of immigrants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree/disagree</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Swedish origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish/Swedish origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native French origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish/French origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both groups in Paris conceive that the government should have a greater responsibility in improving the position of immigrants. This same sentence might be interpreted as a discontent with the – then 2008/2009 – current situation of migrants in Paris.

In Stockholm, the responsibility expected from the government in terms of integration is higher than in the case of France. This is not surprising due to the universal character of the Swedish model. It is expected that the welfare state provides with the necessary mechanism towards assimilation. In this sense, integration is seeing more as a right. Immigrants’ responsibility in integration matters is

---

1 N Stockholm = 501  
N France = 498  
TIES, 2008
much lower. Later the qualitative data will complement this with specific elements that immigrants and the whole Swedish society must follow in order to integrate.

**Figure 3. People with immigrant background should do more to integrate in the national society**

Respondents with Turkish origin in Paris believe to a higher extent that people with immigrant background should assume the responsibility to integrate to the French society. The idea of integration as a duty is more accentuated among people with immigrant ancestry. A similar trend can be observed among people with Turkish background in Stockholm. They also agree - to a larger extent than respondents with a native origin - that immigrants should do more to integrate into the Swedish society. These results told of a relation among immigrant background and the perception of integration as a duty.

A question that is not included the TIES questionnaire about the society’s responsibility will be later taken by qualitative data, in order to distinguish what are the main actors that people associates with the integration process.

---

**A QUALITATIVE APPROACH TOWARDS INTEGRATION:**

**FOR ALL OF US OR ONLY FOR THE NEW ONES?**

**THE PERSONAL MEANING OF INTEGRATION**

It is important to bear in mind that the debates about integration discussed in this study are representative of different approaches. Sweden is a multicultural pioneer and, although it has been contested by different sectors, this is still an important referent behind integration policy. Sweden tries to manage cultural diversity that was acknowledged early on in relation to ethnic minorities. Meanwhile, France has maintained and promoted a strong republican-oriented assimilation policy, without broad recognition of cultural diversity. Integration policy and, thus, the official discourse in France embrace assimilation and regard integration as unilateral. It is the person of immigrant origin that needs to adapt to French society.

The radically different approaches that each country pursues in dealing with integration issues are reflected in the narratives analyzed in this study. The participants were asked about their personal
understandings of integration. The data was analyzed mainly by content analysis. The answers to the semi-structured questionnaire were coded based on the terms and expressions most frequently used and associations most commonly mentioned when referring to integration.

In general, there seems to be agreement among the respondents: integration is about life in the community. Independently of who should integrate into the society, it is a process associated with collective life, adapting and managing differences. Integration as life in a community would require different agents and elements, depending on the specific context of the country. However, the idea of living together was expressed differently in the different countries. In France, immigrants should adapt to the French way of life, while in Sweden integration is associated with life in the community entailing equality, i.e. equal rights irrespective of origin. These narratives were guided by assimilatory and multicultural logics, but there were also new features that people formulated when thinking about identity linked to perceptions of nation-building and welfare considerations.

First, one should not hide oneself because one has another origin. It is about self-respect. One should not try to be somebody who one is not. One should be oneself and adapt oneself in that way because everybody has its limits. Not everybody can adapt as much. What I believe in might be what others believe is wrong. So it is about what one stands for and what one believes when one adapts. [Later]It is important to feel belonging to Sweden. If I would not feel at home in Sweden I would not live here anymore. It is about finding your own place too.

Pia (20) Turkish origin, Stockholm

It is... in the public sphere it is almost as being as the others. In the private sphere one can keep its characteristics and etcaetera, but this is to be integrated in the public sphere.

Annas (20) Turkish origin, Paris

Pia and Annas reflect radical views of what it takes to become integrated in each of these countries. While in France it does not seem acceptable to be openly different in the public sphere, Pia believes that in Sweden it is necessary to be aware of who you are and not want to be different. A way of interpreting these results is by thinking in terms of the opportunity structures that these young people have for incorporating certain features when identifying in social terms.

In Sweden, it seems that a multicultural oriented paradigm not only allows for but also promotes self-identifications other than the Swedish one. Meanwhile, in France the republican paradigm suggests that affiliations or even origins not belonging to French society should be relegated to the private sphere. The understanding of integration is, thus, influenced by national models that people adapt to their language and their everyday experiences. People use certain features and official discourses as well as their personal experiences when defining integration. Both Pia’s and Annas’ origins are present in their understandings of integration. However in the case of Annas this is not explicit. He speaks about “being as the others” and “keeping its characteristics”, already defining a distance to “the others” and as if these characteristics were something different from the national majority. Such a perception is not exactly what the assimilation model expects from its citizens, but it is the way Annas has adapted to the model from his particular situation as a French citizen with Turkish background.

Being integrated in the community is, from my perspective, when you feel that you have exactly the same rights as those born in the country. That there is no us and them-feeling.
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**Bosse (26) Native Swedish origin, Stockholm**

The word integration? It is, firstly, the language… that is is compulsory. Being able to know how to speak French, read French. It is mandatory. After that it is about working. Integration is working. And thirdly is to be open to the French society. For example, be open to the French way of life, the culture.

**Aylin (23) Turkish origin, Paris**

Bosse and Aylin are also representative of other respondents. While being integrated in Sweden is seeing mostly as a matter of rights and inclusion, in France the spontaneous reaction is to consider integration as a duty. And such duty would presuppose structural aspects like the language, but moreover, being open and accept the French culture.

Besides their definition of the term integration, the respondents were asked about their personal position in the integration process and the main elements to be integrated in the national society. The data revealed arguments and elements linked to the country’s citizenship regime. From the data obtained it was possible to distinguish between the French and the Swedish models of integration.

**FRENCH INTEGRATION: ASSIMILATION OF THE ‘NEW ONES’**

In France, the narratives about integration established certain distinctions between the public and the private spheres and between immigrants and French people. Being inserted into French society implies, explicitly, joining the mainstream and, implicitly, leaving behind the notion of being an immigrant in order to become French. These dichotomies were mentioned in a similar manner by people living in Paris, independently of socioeconomic situation, gender or even ethnic ancestry. Nevertheless, people having parents from Turkey sometimes had the feeling that, because they were being asked about integration, they could be seen as “immigrants”. In such cases they expressed very clearly that they were not immigrants and that integration was not something that they could relate to, as Anil expressed it.

I don’t know what is necessary to become French because I was born here. Perhaps somebody who actually comes from Turkey might tell you better.

**Anil (21) Turkish origin, Paris**

Anil’s quote represents the two main tendencies in the processes associated with integration on the part of the people interviewed in Paris. Although Anil was asked about the features necessary for integrating into French society, he immediately associated this with “becoming French”, which was the first tendency registered among Parisians. Integration, being understood as assimilation, would come naturally with being born and growing up in the country. A second tendency is reflected in him saying that the question should be posed to a person that has actually migrated. Interviewees with and without Turkish background referred to *integration for the new ones*. In order to better understand this, it is important to recall official discussions.

The denial of ethnocultural diversity in France, due to the official position that does not promote recognition of cultural, religious or other minority groups but strives for a colour-blind, secular and monocultural society, could entail either absorption into that assimilatory culture or a reactive ethnicity on the part of young people with immigrant background. It was more or less clear that, when defining integration, second generation Turks locate themselves within the national society and do not
feel part of the process. This could be a triumph of assimilation policies but could also represent an effort to disguise difference.

Integration? hmmm...a person coming from immigration ... well, from a foreign country who comes and who will integrate into the culture of the country... more or less.

Kelebek (20) Turkish origin, Paris

Integration but in which sense? I mean this is a very broad question. Bah I… would say that integration makes me associate it very quickly with... the integration of the, of all the immigrated populations, of all the foreign populations.

Celine (33) French origin, Paris

Kelebek and Celine perceive integration in a similar way, and the first thing they associate it with is immigrants, as did most Parisian interviewees. This is being perceived not as a task that national institutions should promote, but a task of immigrants. It is them who have to integrate.

The large majority of the respondents – independent of their ancestry - believe that they do not need to integrate into French society. Being integrated is something that comes automatically with being born in the country. People stated that integration is mostly for newcomers. It is especially interesting the way that second generation Turks do not feel part of the logic of integration, because that is directly related to immigration, and they have not migrated. Being born in France becomes a condition that overrides a person’s ethnic origin. \textit{Ius soli} becomes, in this case, reaffirmed by the French citizens.

I feel I do not need to integrate. I mean, I have never thought about it before. I was born in France so I am French.

Aylin (20) Turkish origin, Paris

Assimilation would be automatic by the fact of being born in France, as if being brought up in an immigrant family would not play a role in a person’s socialization. This could be understood in accordance with a logic that separates the public and private spheres.

Respondents in Paris talk about what is typically expected from the newcomers: acquiring the language, getting a job and respecting the law. People with Turkish background add respecting social rules, “those that everybody knows but nobody told you”. As was previously mentioned, descendants of Turks feel that they come to know these rules from birth, which was not the case for their parents. Those social rules imply, for example, that a person should act French in the public sphere and relegate other cultural allegiances to the private sphere. The division between the private and public spheres is implicit as a condition \textit{sine qua non} for integration.

People have to begin by respecting France and speaking the language. I do not mean knowing the \textit{Marseillaise} because not even myself know it that well. One has to follow the French image.

Audrey (21) French origin, Paris

It seems that knowing French culture is highly valued as a tool for integration, which not only points towards a discourse of integration as a duty but also illustrates one of the main aims of civic integration policies. Integration involves respecting French law, knowing and respecting French society and its values. In spite of the fact that a large majority of the Parisians answered that integration was only for immigrants, they also recognized that integration is similar to citizenship.
duties, so that they would, in an indirect way, also be subject to the integration process because of their condition as citizens, although the rhetoric is constructed in terms of obligations that “newcomers” need to meet.

**INTEGRATION IN STOCKHOLM: THE WELFARE CITIZENS**

Contrary to the narratives in Paris, integration in a Swedish context involves the society as a whole. This topic accounted for few differences between people with native and Turkish background, which is surprising considering that second generation Turks have had more contact with integration policies than native Swedes. Although respondents did associate integration with immigrants, they show a tendency to describe it as a process involving the whole of society, not just immigrants. The idea of an ‘exchange’ and of knowledge of rights and duties were often related to people’s personal perceptions of integration. As Nils and Sandra expressed it:

“It means that one’s believes that… how can I say this, that one is mixed or come together with other people and exchange knowledge in some way.

Nils (28) Swedish origin, Stockholm

It is that time when we come into the society, when you educate yourself to have a job. It also means that one is not an outsider of the society. And I believe that if you are an outsider, then you do not know your rights or your duties and it becomes very difficult to achieve your goals.

Sandra (23) Turkish origin, Stockholm

Nils and Sandra situate themselves within their conception of integration. As in the case of France, life in the community becomes a relevant point of departure for defining integration. There is a social and an individual responsibility. Integration would be a shared task.

Swedish multicultural policies reflected a more structural view of integration and less mention of cultural issues. The discourse about rights involved the idea that people should enjoy equal rights regardless of their differences. Cultural differences in this sense are allowed and are part of the society. The national community should be grounded on equality and not on cultural homogeneity, as was implied in the narratives collected in Paris. Perhaps this is why a majority of the respondents in Stockholm described integration as a process involving society as a whole, including themselves.

In order to be integrated one needs to respect each other, understand each other, know each other, and that … how can I say this… to create some kind of balance among each other.

Sara (20) Turkish origin, Stockholm

We all need to be integrated somehow. We, who have another background, and those who are 100 per cent Swedish. [Integration] It concerns fighting, to develop yourself, inform yourself. Develop yourself through education, culture, everything. To observe and learn about it.

Sandra (23) Turkish origin, Stockholm

Sandra stated that everybody should integrate into Swedish society through personal development and that everybody has distinctive characteristics that should blend into the national mainstream. An implicit multiculturalism is recognized in her answer, as in other narratives about integration among the participants in Stockholm. Integration has a meaning of bringing people together in consideration, respect and enjoyment of their differences. She assigns to the individual a strong agency in the process. At the same time her answer reflects the universal character of integration.
What does it mean for me? A feeling of cohesion in some way. That one is equally valued in spite of one’s physical appearance.

Smek (20) Turkish origin, Stockholm

What Smek defines as integration actually includes two official goals of integration policy in Sweden: cohesion and equality (*lika värde*). Integration is mostly a right to be treated as everybody else. The universal character of such a perception takes for granted that integration was seen as a social process in which everybody is included. Nevertheless, there are also signs of the significant power of the welfare system over people’s reasoning when it comes to societal processes. In this regard, the role that each individual plays in society is expressed, mostly through structural factors, such as finding a job. Both society and the citizens contribute with something during the integration process. People are fully aware of the opportunities offered by the welfare system, and these become both a right and a duty. It is a right since, as tax payers, they partly fund these opportunities. At the same time, it is a duty to take advantage of the good opportunities offered to develop oneself.

If you want to live here so you, of course, somehow need to help to the society, like working and paying taxes and that whole part. And it is, therefore, important to be able to be part of society and to understand the language.

Greta (22) Swedish origin, Stockholm.

You need to find a job and work – like a legal job – and pay taxes and so on. Then, I think you should not come to Sweden to gain something but you should as well stay here and be here as everyone else in Sweden does.

Rebecca (23) Turkish origin, Stockholm.

Both Greta and Rebecca express the importance of making a contribution to the Swedish society when defining integration. A welfare perspective is behind these perceptions. Through work, an individual becomes a tax-payer, which was one of the most important duties associated with Swedish citizenship. Being a worker became almost synonymous with being a good citizen, something that the creators of the Swedish *Folkhem* would have been happy to hear many decades after its foundation. Other quotes on this particular issue are introduced in the chapter on substantial citizenship.

The following table summarizes the different aspects when describing the term integration in Paris and in Stockholm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Integration understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paris</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main elements associated to integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of people with immigrant background in the integration process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION AND LAST REMARKS

Before the fieldwork was conducted it was expected some sort of convergence between the respondents who in a way could react to the new “civic integration” trend. A more marked attitude towards multiculturalism, a stronger position against immigrants and reactive ethnicity could have been attitudes registered as a consequence of a more civic approach towards integration. Surprisingly, people not only seem away from these trends but instead they reaffirm traditional integration models and associate these to citizenship regimes.

One of the main conclusions of this study is that being integrated is understood as becoming a citizen. The national configurations of citizenship are powerful tools into socialization. Such national imprint is, at the time these interviews took place, still particular to each country. Citizens reify what constitutes being a French or a Swedish citizen. Despite their ethnic origin, people born in a certain country define integration as an equivalent of becoming a citizen. The so-called convergence towards a civic integration might still exist but is not as powerful to change models that have been foundational for the citizenry, and are perceived as fundamental in order to become members of the Swedish or French society.

There seems to be a discourse about rights and another about duties when describing the main elements of integration. The discourse about integration as a right emphasizes the necessity of being incorporated and enjoy the same benefits that citizens of that country. The right of being integrated incorporates different actors, not only immigrants, but also native citizens of the country. Sometimes even respondents of native origin mentioned the necessity of being themselves integrated. Integration is, in this sense, regarded as a process that the whole society should undertake. The national institutions play an important role within this logic, as providers of the necessary tools for being integrated. These elements mostly registered during the interviews in Stockholm are characterized by a marked universalistic tone within a welfare state. Individuals have the right not only to being integrated but also to feel at home. A multicultural version of the traditional Folkhem?

The discourse about the duties, usually considering integration as a task of immigrants, stresses the necessity to know and respect the cultural and institutional elements of the country. Such logic, registered mostly among respondents in Paris showed a very marked assimilationist perspective. People associates integration to a series of conditions that immigrants need to fulfil in order to be integrated. Therefore respect and interest towards the French culture are considered as fundamental elements in order to enjoy the privilege of belonging to French society.

The interviewees did not reflected something else than the traditional model for including immigrants and becoming citizens in Sweden and France. Still, their answers reflect very much the spirit of civic integration. Considering Goodman’s definition of the term, it seems that the respondents reflect a civic aim even if they were not subjects of civic integration policies. Although France has adopted integration policies towards this approach, the people interviewed were born before such changes. Still, they know the main “civic codes” in order to be integrated into the French society to such an extent that even those who have immigrant ancestry do not consider themselves as “foreign”. The assimilation discourse has indeed been absorbed by people with and without immigrant ancestry. In the French case it is important to leave cultural particularities at home. Meanwhile such particularities should be brought into the public sphere in order to contribute to the society in the Swedish case. Could this assimilationism and universalism be part of the language of citizens due to a successful indoctrination or is it the reflection of practical matters? More than socialization integration is regarded as a practical attitude, set of tools, and obligations for being part of the national society. In the case of Sweden, the respondents show that despite a total absence towards civic integration policies, the absorption of Swedish main social codes and understanding of the socio-
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The political system is a reality among young people with Turkish background. The universalism of the welfare state is being reproduced by people, who are aware of rights and benefits of this model.

The results of this study could be interpreted as good news for the national paradigms in the countries studied. Despite the presence or absence of civic integration policies, citizens are true representatives of the national model. Nevertheless, it is important to consider that the target group of this study is formed by citizens of migrant origin who were born in both Sweden and France. A first consideration in this regard is that civic integration policies are mostly oriented to first generation immigrants. Second, the acquisition of citizenship is usually a goal within civic integration process, a reward after having completed integration plans, passed integrations tests or fulfilled integration contracts. In this case, all the individuals interviewed were already citizens of France or Sweden and those with Turkish ancestry were also citizens in Turkey. Still, their discourse about citizenship and integration is centred in their country of residence which talks about a successful integration but also about the power of the national discourses. Third, no reactive ethnicity was measured among the respondents with Turkish ancestry. This could be a sign of success for integration policies but also a sample bias. Turks are neither the most stigmatized nor the most marginalized group in Sweden or France. The situation could be different if the interviews would take place in Germany. A larger study would be needed to draw generalizations, but the aim of this study was not to generalize but to offer a picture of the discourse about integration and citizenship in countries with dissimilar integration policies.

Civic integration relies on a set of civic skills that would demonstrate a full membership and to some extent, a sense of belonging towards the country where a migrant desires to stay. Such full membership is what will empower immigrants to successfully integrate in the political and economic spheres, and it empowers the national society as a whole by creating a cohesive community of individuals faithful to an idea of nation despite their ethnic belonging. This is, indeed, what the participants of this study showed, even if they do not refer to stricter rules regarding migration or citizenship tests.

Although the perceptions analyzed in this paper tend to reflect a positive image of a cohesive national society, there has been a series of incidents that might be pointing to a failure of the integration models here discussed. After the terrorist attacks to the Charlie Hebdo’s headquarters in France, a fierce attitude defending free speech seem to reify the republican values and undermine the value of diversity. The riots in Malmö in 2008 and a suicidal attack in Stockholm in 2010 could presuppose the beginning of the end for a multicultural policy. Moreover, the electoral power gained by the Sweden Democrats – a self-declared anti-immigrant party – could pave the way to the transformation towards a civic integration model. Still, the main political parties in the Swedish Parliament have been resistant against the imposition of language tests and integration contracts. Integration is still perceived by most Swedish politicians as a right and not a set of duties that need to be fulfilled in order to be granted with Swedish citizenship. Considering these events and the empirical results of this study, Sweden and France have been faithful to their models in both a micro and micro level.
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