Among 'other' Citizens: Denizens and Anti-citizens

A Study of Exclusion of Undocumented Migrants at three Authorities in Helsingborg Municipality

Anna Espmarker
Maria Fagerberg

Tutor: Lars Harrysson Senior lecturer and fil.doctor in Social Work; Lund University

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to expand the debate on undocumented migrants' social rights from a theoretical perspective emphasizing social and political practices of inclusion and exclusion. We examine how processes of exploitation and stigmatization contribute to a categorization and positioning of undocumented migrants as non-citizens. We explore this in a dialogue with three authorities working with migrants in Helsingborg. The bachelor thesis also aims to illuminate how the unequal categorization is justified, within the organization of an authority.

The theoretical perspectives present a framework allowing us to discuss power relations and the process of positioning undocumented migrants as 'the others'. We highlight how different mechanisms exclude and include undocumented migrants in relation to the concept of citizenship.

We used vignette cases as a method to lead our interview persons into a group discussion about undocumented migrants, a phenomenon commonly perceived as invisible. The aim is that the vignette should be as connected to reality as possible, thus we focus on real praxis, court proceedings and jurisdictions in the construction of the cases.

We outline hegemonic discourses of how the authorities discuss the position of undocumented migrants. We examine how social rights depend on the positioning of undocumented migrants. In the Social Service Act, it is stated that the municipality has got the outmost responsibility for persons staying there. It seems to be crucial that the physical person staying in a specific municipality has a couple of legal attributes confirming her/his right to be present, to be eligible for social assistance. A legal attribute could be a residence permit or a passport with a Swedish civic registration number. We do also examine how the authorities discuss the position of undocumented migrants in relation to housing, temporarily residence permit and to themselves as professional social workers.

We conclude that the process to get an 'il/legal' status is not linear and involves moments of inclusion and exclusion from rights. There is a scale of different degrees of exclusion which conditions social rights not only for undocumented migrants, but also for migrants with temporarily and permanent residence permit. The authorities interviewed reproduce the position of undocumented migrants as non-citizens or as anti-citizens. They maintain a

discourse of 'illegality' that in visualise the situation of undocumented migrants and position them as 'illegal'.

Acknowledgements

Late in the afternoon at Söderpunkten, a shopping mall and a meeting point in the southern city of Helsingborg, it is crowded with people and anonymous faces. A few steps away, a refugee councillor at the Migration Board turns off her computer and organizes the piles of documents on her desk, before she closes the door to the office and takes the elevator down to the main street. At Söderpunkten a man finishes a coffee in a café. He looks around nervously; this is the first day in two weeks he leaves the apartment and the area in the southern periphery of Helsingborg. The councillor enters Söderpunkten; she has been looking forward to this weekend. In the escalator she smiles at a man, when he let her go first. The man seems familiar. When he recognizes her it is already too late. He stares at her terrified. The second after she is gone, he is sweating heavily. On her way home, she remembers the face of the man that was Farouk, a client she had a long time ago. She had always wondered what happens to the clients that disappear after a refusal on entry to Sweden.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

There exist no public statistics presenting how many undocumented migrants there are in Sweden. The first six months in the year 2007, around 17 0000 asylum seekers applied for residence permit in Sweden. Out of them 9500 were refused entry (www.migrationsverket.se). We cannot say how many of these asylum seekers that are still staying in Sweden. In Helsingborg, at the Migration Board, 25 asylum-seekers disappeared after (Interview at the Migration Board, Helsingborg, November 2007) after a decision of refusal to entry has been taken, during the first half of year 2007. They might be staying and hiding in Helsingborg or they might be elsewhere. It is even more difficult to say how many undocumented migrants there are in Sweden that have not been in contact with Swedish authorities or that received a refusal to entry some years ago.

The focus in our essay is not to illuminate the every day life of undocumented migrants. We do only have fragmented pictures of the living conditions of undocumented migrants hidden in Helsingborg city. The fragments come from interview persons and from personal encounters by people working in NGOs with undocumented migrants. We argue that even if there is said to be no contact area between undocumented migrants and authorities, because undocumented migrants hide from the authorities, there exists a conditioned relation. The relation is determined by the status of citizenship upheld by the migrant.

We believe that the situation of undocumented migrants and the representation of them as 'illegal' partly is a result of a restricted immigration politics in Sweden and the nations in Europe included by the Dublin Convention, 1994. We think it is politically relevant to study how authorities create and reproduce the situation of undocumented migrants. We do not penetrate the immigration debate on a political policy level, but rather on an administration - and implementation level. The focus is to deconstruct how authorities, discuss the rights of undocumented migrants. According to the Social Services Act 2§, the Municipality has the foremost responsibility of persons staying there. We know that undocumented migrants are staying in Helsingborg. How do authorities discuss the existence of undocumented migrants? Do authorities recognize it to be a problem? What actions can they take and what kind of responsibilities against undocumented migrants do they have?

We find it important from a social work perspective to illuminate the actual consequences that restrictive system is creating. As well as working towards changes in legislation and of norms and values that undermines the implementation of social policies and in everyday life. Not to propose that social work only is limited to work with consequences but as an immediate visualization of the conditions that many persons in Europe face today. Social work can be defined as the arms of the system by reshaping and reproducing the values and norms of the system or as an opposite critical work within society; defending rights of affected groups. This is a normative standpoint that implies an ideology that advocates equal rights for all human beings. We defend the social rights of undocumented migrants, in the sense that we suggest persons staying and conducting their daily lives in Sweden should have equal rights to social provision and social security. We do not believe in a social and political system that territorializes social rights within a restrictive frame of citizenship.

1.1 Objectives

Our objective is to study how municipal and state authorities discuss the position of undocumented migrants. We aim to further examine the concept of citizenship in relation to undocumented migrants staying in Helsingborg.

1. How is the position of undocumented migrants discussed by social workers within the Introduction Team, the House of Possibilities, Integration Service and the Migration Board in Helsingborg?

2. What hegemonic discourses are reproduced in the discussions? How are the hegemonic discourses legitimated within the authorities?

1.2 Disposition

The thesis is divided in two parts after the introduction chapter. First a theoretical and methodological chapter, that includes the theoretical framework and the methodological approach in both the material collection and analytic process of this study. Part two contains the empirical results in an analysis elaborated from the theoretical standpoints and our final conclusions.

1.3 Definitions of concepts

In our bachelor thesis we use the terminology undocumented migrant. There are many different terms used in social science literature as a categorization of a homogenous group as e.g. 'illegal' immigrants, 'illegal' aliens that we want to criticise in accordance with De Genova's problematization of the nonlinear teleology of these categories (2002:420). Media and politicians use as well the term 'illegal' while describing and discussing immigration and immigration politics. De Genova states a discourse that defines the 'illegal' migration as the problem and not the nation state or the immigration politics per se (a.a.). When using the term 'illegal' the risk of reproducing the discursive power of the immigration legislation appears (Khosravi: 2006:285). During our literature search we have found the use of irregular, extra-legal as well as clandestine as problematized terms replacing 'illegal' but we have chosen undocumented because of the terms structural implications. It is not the migrant itself that is breaking the rules by being defined as 'illegal' or irregular, the position as undocumented refers to the structures of a system that restricts documentations of migrants.

Sometimes the authorities' definitions and defined boundaries have led us to discuss a certain group of undocumented migrants, defined as a group according to their legal position as e.g. individuals with a refused prolonged temporary residence permit. But our ambition was not to focus on a special group, it was to use the term undocumented migrant to highlight the position of a person that stays in the country without her or his legal documents. We wanted to discuss the possibilities of undocumented migrants to contact the different authorities. The group of undocumented migrants is not a homogenous group; there are many ways in which a person can become an undocumented migrant in relation to the state, lacking the legal attributes required. For example; entering the country 'legally' or 'illegally', staying after a decision of refusal to entry, staying in the country without applying for residence or work permit, staying after the tourist visa, work permit or temporary residence permit expired or as a victim for trafficking. (Khosravi: 2006:290) We focus on the process of 'illegality', not on the asylum seeking process neither on the actual situation of undocumented migrants in Sweden. We focus on how this process position undocumented migrants on the other side of the physical border and how the limits of the authorities' field of work are created.

When we use the term authority; we mean a state or municipal organization that has the power to make decisions over individual's economy, health and family. The Migration Board makes all decision concerning asylum seekers/ migrant's legal status and their permission to stay or not. The Introduction Team makes decisions about introduction reimbursement and education. The House of Possibilities makes decisions according to the Social Service Act, concerning cash-benefit and other forms of social assistance. The Integration Service is not an authority; it is a municipal permanent project. One project leader at the Integration Service confirms that the project often is mistaken to be an authority by their clients, primarily because they are situated in the same building as the Vision Centre, where other authorities as the Introduction Team works. Secondly because they have contacts with other authorities in diverse ways and help the clients to appeal negative decisions.

We have choose to use the term client as a denominator of all different ways that our interview persons did describe their target groups that they encounter in their field of work.

This to simplify and make our analysis easier to grasp; who is within and who is not, when we use the term client it refers to the actual defined target group of each authority.

1.4 Former research

There are several different research areas already covered by former research. For example we found research about the experience being an asylum seeker in different countries. How the asylum seeking process generates feelings like fear, frustration and sometimes violence. This is both qualitative research based on interviews and quantitative research based on statistics, often defining the status of health among refugees and migrants. One part of the research, concerning our chosen area, is about im/migration and integration, and how this is being handled by media, by social policies and legislation. While our main focus will be on organizational structures and the safeguarding and negotiation of boundaries of the authorities' field of work, in relation to undocumented migrants we find it relevant to illuminate the national and international former research about, undocumented migrants, citizenship, legal status and the territorialisation of rights.

No former research have in a significant extent examined the relation and meeting between undocumented migrants and social service offices in Sweden, according to the professional role of the social worker, responsibility, civil disobedience and the positioning of the non-citizens by the authorities. We have found one bachelor thesis from, Stockholm University, that brings up the encounter or non-encounter between undocumented migrants and state authorities, related to the staying concept and social and civil rights; from a juridical science approach (Österling:2006). A rapport from Malmö University examines organization and division of responsibility and cooperation between authorities in the receiving of asylum seekers (Appelqvist: 2006).

Different state publications relate to the debate, mentioned above, in commission reports from the Swedish governments elaborating the welfare states boundaries and the construction of 'we' and 'them', categorization, (see: SOU 2006:37[1] and SOU 2005:41[2]) We have not found any state publications concerning undocumented migrants rights to cash benefits and social services and the outmost responsibility of the municipality according to the Social Service Act. The parliamentary ombudsman (JO) wrote in 1994/95[3] a report about the outermost responsibility and obligations of the Municipalities in relation to undocumented migrants that

---

[1] SOU 2006:37 *Om välfärdens gränser och det villkorade medborgarskapet*

[2] 2005:41 *Bortom vi och dem-- teoretiska reflektioner om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering*
[3] JO Rapport 1994/95 *Socialtjänstens ansvar för asylsökande som vägrats uppehållstillstånd.*

have absconded from deportation. There is an unclearness of the Social Service Act and its contingent interpretations.

International research concerning global migration, citizenship and the position of undocumented migrant's touches the area of identity, 'race', nation, class, gender, which is further problematized in culture studies and feminist post-colonial research. The existing research about the boundaries of citizenship and territorialized citizens rights and undocumented migrants; a wide range of studies have been done on an international level se for example; Seyla Benhabib (2004), Nira Yuval-Davis (1997), Saskia Sassen (1988, 1990, 1996, 1998, 1999), Randall Hansen (1999), Ruth Lister (1998, 2003). Some common discussed perspectives and issues are the realization of a global citizenship, the role of the nation state in the era of globalization, outer an inner boarder control. The territorialisation of rights is in this debate often discussed as a form of exploitation of undocumented migrants as cheap labour force se Thomas Hammar (1999), Nicholas De Genova (2002). De Genova stresses the importance to examine the historical and socio-political processes of 'illegalization' in his article where he makes a review of the ethnographically informed research concerning undocumented migrants (2002).

We have been using Ruth Lister's conceptualization of the exclusionary boarders of citizenship and the *degree of inclusiveness* to illuminate and examine the exclusionary processes in an authority's forming of boundaries according to interpretation of the legislations (2003).

We have found some reports and literature about the actual situation from the perspective of undocumented migrants and human rights, non-access to social and civil rights and the situation in Sweden written by organizations such as Medecins Sans Frontieres (2005), FARR[4], PICUM[5] (2003) and by the journalist Sanna Vestin (1999, 2006).

---

[4] Flyktinggruppernas och asylkommitéernas riksförbund, in Sweden
[5] Platform for international cooperation on undocumented migrants

2. Theoretical framework

An analytical as well as an epistemological focus in our text is to study how social workers in different positions discuss undocumented migrants. We aim to bring up theories that help us to discuss in what way the situation of undocumented migrants are represented by our interview persons. A challenge to be met while studying this issue is how to approach a subject that is made invisible or/and neutral. The situation of undocumented migrants was not seen as relevant by our interview persons due to the description of their tasks at work. How do you approach a phenomenon that the interview persons do not include in their field of work? We argue that undocumented migrants are an issue that concerns authorities, *in some aspects* and we have chosen theories to highlight; how authorities frame their field of work and responsibility, how the authorities participate and legitimize the process of illegality and how different mechanisms exclude and include undocumented migrants in relation to the concept of citizenship.

2.1 Discourses and Power Relations

Foucault states that power is relational (Franzén: 2000:86ff). We understand the concept of power as a relation between two contingent positions. The interrelation between the positions creates a tension. The tension suggests a power relation, though it generates a resistance. A power relation is not fixed, but is changeable to a certain extent. The possibility given to a person, an organization or an institution, to hold a position or several positions varies. This is called a subject's position (Winther Jörgensen and Philips: 2000:48). A discourse contains of an amount of positions in a net, creating a complex number of power relations. The net excludes positions and includes other, in a process that divides one discourse from another discourse. The discursive mechanisms of power conceal the inclusion of some positions on the behalf of other positions (Winther Jörgensen and Philips: 2000:33).

The net of positions, constructing a discourse, is omni-present. There are no actions taken outside the discourse (Franzén: 2000:86ff). We define the position in a room as a discursive position. The place gives the body a special meaning, and the way the body moves in an environment affects the meaning of the room. There are power relations, between two persons, but equally between a place and a body. We read social practices, places and bodies as a text.

2.2 Discursive positions and configurations

In our analysis of power relations in a social context, the discursive positions of an organization or a person are of interest. As Foucault puts it, "Everyone knows that anyone can't say whatever whenever and whoever can't talk about whatever."(Foucault: 1993:7)[6]

In other terms we are interested to further examine who can say what, when and how. To realize this, not only the strength of the relation but also the position of the statement being said or the social practices being performed, are important to pinpoint. Charles Tilly, a professor in social research, illuminates the question of relations, positions and power within an organizational frame. The concept of, what he names, relation analysis is to study how inequality is reproduced in relations, depending on the configuration of these relations. The configuration of relations is constructed in a cultural, political and social context. Tilly connects the theory of relations to the question of social change. Why are these relations of power durable? (1998:21). In our text, the position of undocumented migrants placed in a context of social work at three authorities and one authority-like project, is of interest. How are different power relations reproduced in a discussion about undocumented migrants? We aim to highlight discussions about how social workers reflect on their position and what statements they can make from that position. Furthermore we find it relevant to understand how these statements are being legitimated.

2.3 Why do inequalities endure?

Tilly describes five building blocks of configurations. The configurations should be understood as social relations, which structure an organization[7]. The use of configurations, benefice our theoretical framework by adding a structural element to Foucault's concept of discourse, which facilitates the analysis of what could be expressed from different positions and power relations within or between organizations. In the figure of a building block, positions are differently related to each other. Two of the building blocks are of special

---

[6] Freely interpreted and translated by Anna Espmarker and Maria Fagerberg "Alla vet att man inte får säga allt, att man inte kan tala om vad som helst när som helst och, slutligen, att inte vem som helst får tala om vad som helst ." (Foucault, 1970:7)

[7] We do not use Tilly's definition of an organization, seen as one of five prototypes for a social configuration. From our perspective an organization is built up of a combination of several different configurations (1998:47). In our analysis the most important of these configurations are categorical pairs and the hierarchies

interests for us; the hierarchy and the categorical pair (1998:47f). Tilly identifies different categorical pairs, for example man/woman, black/white and citizen/alien. One category excludes the other category. According to Tilly, the boundary that separates a categorical pair is relational, which implies that it is negotiable (1998:62f). In a hierarchy, one position is placed above another position. Several positions above each other form a hierarchical chain (1998:48f). We consider the significance of a hierarchy to be an asymmetric power relation. The combination of the two configurations: hierarchy and categorical pair, Tilly introduces as the concept of categorical inequality (1998:84). The institutionalization of the combination: hierarchy and categorical pair reinforces durable inequality (1998:8:72). Categorical inequality is not predetermined to cause damage in an organization, but as a result of the asymmetric division of categories, it contributes to exclude persons from common goods and from develop life skills. Citizenship, a concept further developed in our theoretical framework below, is an example of a boundary that constitutes a state of exclusion or/and inclusion.

In the absence of resistance from members of subordinated categories, persons in an organization adapt to hierarchic structures. They learn how to safeguard boundaries that result in exclusion of others. The learning process gives employers and employees a script of how to conserve the boundaries that result in durable inequality (1998:97). In our analysis, we will highlight patterns of how the division between foremost citizens and non-citizens are safeguarded. The 'script of inclusion and exclusion', which reproduces inequality, is upheld by two processes: exploitation and opportunity hoarding. Exploitation refers to a situation where a group controls valuable and labour-demanding resources. The control demands from them to use the labour from others, which are excluded from the value added to the work. Exploitation is complemented by so-called opportunity hoarding. Opportunity hoarding is a way for the non-elite to gain influence, by using their categorically bounded network to get access to valuable resources. When an undocumented migrant hide from the authorities a support from a network of relatives or friends becomes important because e.g. they give access to a place to hide. Emulation and adaptation seem to support the processes above. In every social interaction imitation exists. When a new organisation or a new branch of an organization is founded, the same phenomena of emulating already existing patterns of exploitation and opportunity hoarding come up (Tilly: 1998:86ff).

Tilly argues that exclusion of undocumented migrants from recourses such as social services and support is a form of exploitation (1998:88). He defines exploitation as organized inequality illuminating the division of citizens and non-citizens as an example of this, a categorization that legitimize unequal treatment.

A concept that is highly relevant in the discussion exploitation and durable inequality is stigmatization. Mulinari and de los Reyes (2004) argue that the reproduction of a dichotomy between processes of exploitation and stigmatizing is misleading, these concepts do not have to be contradictory. They underline the mutual dependence between discourses that legitimize exploitation and discourses that create "the other" (2004:40). Illuminating the reinforcing dimensions between stigmatization and exploitation, as to say that stigmatization of a group reproduces and upholds the exploitation this homogenously defined group is exposed to. Stressing the possibility to explore another dimension in construction if inequality between norms and power (2004:42). Stigmatization is defined, by Mulinari and de los Reyes, according to Foucault; as a form of power action by the societal consensus of what is the right, the possible and the natural (2004:43). Individuals and groups that stand outside of the societal norms are viewed as divergent.

2.4 The making of "the other"

To embrace the multi faceted discussion of 'we' and 'them' it is important to analyze how groups of undocumented migrants, refugees or aliens are categorized as the others. In feminist and post-colonial theories the illumination of categorizations and the making of 'the other' are wide elaborated concepts, and so is the categorization of the western, white man in contrast to 'the others'. Chandra Talpade Mohanty examines in her famous text *Under western eyes* western feminist studies and texts that define the 'third world woman' as a monolithic subject (2003:33ff). She illuminates that the western feminist movement and researchers use women as a categorical analytic tool, supposing the homogeneity of women as one group with same experiences of submission and oppression (2003:34). The discursive and unanimous perception of the homogeneity of the woman confuses with different existing groups of women. The model of the interest and experiences sets the hegemonic discourse from western feminist movements (a.a.). We draw a parallel to undocumented migrants in Talpade Mohanty's work. We find it interesting and relevant to discuss how migrants in general and undocumented migrants in particular, like 'the third world woman', are being reproduced as

'the other' and as one monolithic group. What colonial discourse decides how the group of undocumented migrants shall be represented?

Masoud Kamali, a professor in social work, underlines in the Commission Report (2005:41) that the 'Swedishness' is neither a given identity nor an essential state; it is a privileged position that gives a preference to rights, status and ingress to the material and symbolic resources in society (SOU 2005:41:s29f). In comparison with the model of national identity, a Swedish identity, shares a 'common sense' value and norm for how a 'Swedish' person expects to identify and conduct. The existence of an 'otherism' of the 'others' that are not like us is shaping the 'we'. The 'we' presuppose the existence of 'them' to draw the lines of what 'we' are (SOU 2005:41:s29f).

2.5 'Other' citizens; denizens and anti-citizens

In this bachelor thesis, we find it interesting to bring together different theoretical conceptualizations of inclusion and exclusion. We discuss citizenship in the context of how rights are being territorialized, linked to nation states and the proclamation of citizen rights. The professor of Social Policy Ruth Lister stresses the exclusionary borders of citizenship, excluding all non-citizens from the citizens proclaimed social, legal and political rights (2003:42). The relation between reclaiming rights and citizenship is one factor of exclusion of the non-citizens staying in a country with or without documents. But even a citizen or legal residence can get their rights questioned or violated by structural and institutionalized practices created by cretin norms and values of how the Swedish citizen must be and must act.

As T H Marshall stated citizenship includes civic, political and social rights. The meaning of citizenship developed by T H Marshall defines citizenship as the status of enjoying rights (Lister: 1998:5). The sociologist Ruth Lister stresses the importance of citizenship as a *practice*. Lister makes a distinction between being a citizen and acting as a citizenship. As a citizen you enjoy certain rights, but you might not be enabled to act upon them, as a consequence. In Lister's word, every citizen may not be admitted to full legal citizenship (Lister: 1998:7).

Lister argues that inclusion and exclusion through citizenship operates both on a legal and a sociological level through 'formal' and 'substantive' modes of citizenship (2003:44ff). The formal citizenship implies the legal status of a citizen, as a holder of documents/a passport.

The substantive citizenship denotes the possession of rights and duties within a nation state. The formal citizenship precedes the substantive citizenship, it is not possible to enjoy the rights restricted within nation states borders if one does not have legal documents; the person then becomes an undocumented 'illegal' migrant. Within nation states different groups are proclaimed and enjoy different degree of substantive rights, 'the degree of inclusiveness' differs according to the existing social divisions and categorizations that are being reproduced (a.a.). The substantial citizenship does not automatically follow the formal citizenship. Racial discrimination, argues Lister, structural categorizations, harassments and violence are processes of exclusion that undermine the substantive citizenship for e.g. migrants, both legal non-citizens and citizens (a.a.). A similar observation is made by the social anthropologist Shahram Khosravi that defines the undermined social, civil and political rights for formal citizens as a conditioned citizenship (SOU 2006:37:s287f). Khosravi also relates to a discussion held by the Swedish government about the possibility to retrieve a formal citizenship in certain cases as a symbol of an existing quasi-citizenship (a.a.)

To conceptualize the exclusionary borders of citizenship; we find it relevant to visualize a scale of exclusion depending on both legal and substantive status that all stand in relation to the 'pure' citizen. Denizen and anti-citizens are two elaborated concepts in the discussion of migration, exclusion from social and civil rights and immigration politics.

Thomas Hammar (1999), political scientist, conceptualizes the status of documented migrants, with permanent or temporary residence permit, as denizens (1999:175). They are not formal citizens but through their legal stay in the country, they are proclaimed some social and civil rights. But as they are not fully citizens their possible reclaims of these rights are limited, and in many countries the rights of denizens are fragile, uncertain and are being conditioned and with drawn e.g. if the denizen commits a crime (Lister: 2003:49). The concept denizen has been used in some interesting historical ways that are relevant to illuminate for an in-depth perception of how Lister (2003:49) and Hammar (1999:175) conceptualize the term. Denizen was used before the abolition of slavery in the United States as a status of the former slaves and has its proceedings in the 13th century in the English common-law-system. As a status by

which foreigner gained some privileges and rights in Great Britain, as for example the right to hold land in England (wikipedia.org).

The concept denizen is both a legal status as a result from the restrictive a prolonged process of becoming a full citizen in a country; a denizen can be defined as a middle status, between an alien and a citizen and as a concept to illuminate the fragility and conditioning of this legal status and the lack of full social, civil rights a person with temporary and permanent residence permit face.

Citizenship is central to welfare regimes. The development of a welfare state is interdependent on the development of rights associated with citizenship. The abstract and neutral description of a citizen has been questioned though the citizen commonly is represented as a white, heterosexual, middle-class man. (O'Connor: 2004:181). Part from the critics of a seemingly neutral citizen, the construction of nations has a built-in factor that separates citizens from non-citizens. This is an exclusionary factor. Khosravi develops a concept of this exclusionary position of non-citizen that he defines as an anti-citizen. The shaping of the anti-citizens becomes a symbol, a definition of the problem around the anti-citizen that can be a risk of disturbing the purity of citizenship (SOU 2006:37:s300). An anti-citizen is a person that stands out from the general system of rules, a person that break these rules and norms. An anti-citizen is identified as a lawbreaker, without identity, irresponsible, insensible and amoral. An anti-citizen is a load for the welfare system, somebody that could risk the wellbeing of the society and of the existing norms, virtue and values (a.a). This anti-citizen is a symbol for the position of the undocumented migrant and by shaping an anti-position, contrasting the citizen, the responsibility from the state, the authorities and the society becomes unclear.

The absolute exclusion from a territory and from a formal citizenship or a denizen status brings us to the discussion about the shaping of 'illegality'. By staying on the wrong side of the boarder a person become 'illegal'. How is the process of illegality being legitimized?

2.6 Discourses of 'illegality'

De Genova underlines the juridical status of 'illegality', which requires a social relation to the state, between the state and the undocumented migrant (2002:422f). This relation shapes a political and juridical position that Khosravi (2006:37:s286) as well as De Genova

(2002:422f) highlight as a process shaped by the immigration legislation. By the process and institutionalization and implementation of this legislation and as a social position that is shaped in the everyday relations within society for the undocumented migrant.

We do not have the objectives to focus on 'the group' of undocumented migrants in this text, as a categorization of a homogenous group, but to focus on a discourse of 'illegality', depending, as mentioned above, on the immigration legislation, the implementation, the processes of 'illegality' and the everyday norms and values about border and law crossings. De Genova brings up the statement of Foucault; that the existence of legal prohibition creates illegal practices and actions (2002: 422).

> Illegality, both theoretically and practically, is a social relation that is fundamentally inseparable from citizenship (De Genova: 2002:422)

Like the use of the term anti-citizen De Genova illuminates the dichotomy between the legal and illegal (2002:423). The creation of a legal position requires a definition of the illegal position and the borders are here constructed, with the two positions as inseparable from each other. The welfare vacuum as a political, social and il/legal space, becoming a place for everyone that is being positioned in this space in contrast to the legal, is created in this process. Our question is how it is being legitimized? The use of the term 'illegality' is being produced as an effect of the practical materiality of the law; the hegemonic discourse created by the immigration law.

De Genova relates to Foucault's analysis of power when illuminating the productivity of the law generally and particularly the process and production of migrant 'illegality'. Foucault defines power as productive and generated, especially in the way of defining "illegal" practices and the shaping of delinquency (2002:425f). De Genova defines the development of e.g. migration law, its historical extraction, its process and contingent definitions of the law as a practice. This is a practice of historical and ideological struggles that form, discipline structure and define the non-citizen. Like an instrument to discipline and control the migration and the mobilisation within and from outside the national borders (a.a.).

Shahram Khosravi underlines that the process of illegalization of undocumented migrants exclude them from social and political rights and the term 'illegal' reproduces the everyday

association between border crossing migration and the act to break the law (SOU 2006:37:s293). The criminalization is shaped by the fact that the undocumented migrant is physically staying in a place without the right to stay there.

3. Methodology

3.1 Our approach to qualitative research

We have chosen to approach a qualitative methodology. A qualitative method represents an opportunity to study experiences and social practices in an organization, which leads to a deeper understanding of the meaning of a phenomenon (Repstad: 1993:8). A characteristic of qualitative research is the parallel processes, where the formulation of the objectives, the collection of data and the beginning of an analysis is formulated at the same time (1999: 13). The parallel process results in an intellectual flexibility, which contributes to a critical discussion along with the work. A further ambition with a qualitative research has been to deconstruct the distance between the researcher and the objects of the research and create a subject-to subject relation with the interviewer and the interview person (Davies & Esseveld: 1989:25f) to develop the idea of how to create a subject-to subject relation, action research has influenced the qualitative method.

The objective has been to grasp how a group of social workers discusses a certain subject and how they position themselves in a wider discursive context. To examine how undocumented migrants are being discussed, we have chosen to do interviews, one by one or in pairs and to be inspired by discourse analysis as a tool to critically approach the interviews. We have chosen to make group interviews which, the two sociologists Eva Palmblad and Mats Börjesson underline, can work as a good strategy to comprehend and perceive the hegemonic discourse in its shape and limits within a special context. In a group the valid statements are limited by the group, and these limitations are more likely to be visualised in a group interview (Palmblad: 2007:17).

A methodological problem has been to find a creative way to handle the in visualization of undocumented migrants. Confusion has been a common reception of our objective to discuss undocumented migrants within authorities. 'Per definition we do not work with undocumented migrants, though they are hiding from us', has been one telling response from a interview. The use of vignette studies has made it easier for our interview persons to relate to a problem, which seemed to be outside their area of competence.

We will present our methodology in two parts. The first explain our epistemological standpoints and how they have been applied. The second is a description of how the interviews were realized. Both parts are inseparable with the 'work in progress' of the bachelor thesis

3.2 Epistemological standpoints

3.2.1 Participation

Participatory action research (PAR) has inspired and partly structured the realization of our research project. One incentive to utilize action research is that the researcher is part of the learning process as well as the participants in the study. The ideal in PAR is that the research problems are defined and solved together (Hall, 2001: 173). Our employment of PAR has resulted in a method where we take under consideration the concepts of power, participation and influence. The structure of our method has been to encourage discussions in groups of colleagues. As a starting point the participants have read two vignettes about undocumented migrants in Sweden. Furthermore the participants have answered some open-ended questions, added to the vignettes. The idea was that group-discussions would increase the degree of participation. The participants would have the opportunity to discuss, not only with us, but also with each other. If there was an uncertainty about the subject or the interview-situation, the participants would have a chance to support each other. As 'action researchers' we consider the participants as bearer of knowledge. We have chosen not to fully realize an action research project partly because we decided to do interviews with authorities and not a community with a self-defined need of empowerment, and partly because the structure of an authority is hierarchical.

3.2.2 Hegemonic discourses

According to Foucault power is not produced solely from a top-down perspective, but as we interpret his work he opens up for a discussion about discourses working on different levels. In *Diskursens Ordning,* he mentions that some discourses are more permanent and influent. The discourses he refers to, reshapes other discourses and create new ones. The rivalry of defining the order of things is to be described as a struggle. The area of conflict is constituted by discourses struggling to get a superposition and a greater influence on the definition of the

'reality' (Foucault, 1993:16). The discourses superposed to other discourses is defined as hegemonic discourses in our text (se for example Listerborn, 2002 and Winther Jörgensen and Philips, 2000)

We stress the importance of using the different criteria's of a hegemonic discourse in our analysis as a tool of structuring and visualize the shape of the discourse and to analyse its imitation within one or many authorities in the same field. To apply the concept of hegemonic discourse, in a systematic way, we set up four criteria's for a hegemonic discourse:

a) it gives less, if any, space for other interpretations (dominant-influent)

b) it is repeated by several interview persons (imitation)

c) it is possible to associate with a greater political, social or cultural context over time(contextualization- permanent)

d) it is possible to discern from other discourses (limitation)

3.2.3 Vignette studies

By reading Shahram Khosravi's chapter in the Commission report 2006: 37, we got inspired of how to use vignette cases as a ground to lead our interview persons in to the discussion about phenomenon perceived as invisible. Vignette studies were developed in the beginning of 1950's within quantitative methodology, with the ambition to create social fact about stratification (Jegerby: 1999:23). Later on open questions have been added to the standardized questions alternatives (1999: 23). Our intention to use vignette cases is qualitative, and our ambitions is to use the vignettes as a ground for discussion and as a way of approaching a discussion about a social problem that is being invisualized.

Our use of vignette cases in our thesis implied that our interview persons in groups could reflect and discuss over a fictively written cases. Thus we focused on real praxis, court proceedings and jurisdictions in the construction of our cases. The idea was that the vignette should be as connected to reality as possible and be relevant to our objectives and questions about undocumented migrants and welfare vacuum. After writing the vignettes, Asylgruppen[8] in Lund was contacted to read and reflect over the credibility of the cases and as a test to see that they were logic.

---

[8] Asylgruppen in Lund is an voluntary organization/network that supports and help asylum seekers and undocumented migrants, legally and socially.

We constructed two cases and with the key in our hands, one of the two cases was more relevant to our interview persons. Not to say that the second vignette was not close to reality, interestingly this case was a woman that had been hiding during a couple of years, an invisible case. Our vignette's was constructed in two phases with some time spin in between; both of the vignettes were about alone adults that had experienced different parts of the asylum seeking process. The vignette showed clearly the nonlinear process of asylum seeking, something we illuminated throughout all our interviews. (see appendix 1).

3.3 Line of action

3.3.1 Contact

Our focus was to reach social workers and handling officers at the House of Possibilities under Visions Centre, the Introduction Team, the Integration Service and the Unit of the Swedish Migration Board in the municipality of Helsingborg, that would like to participate in our study. We followed the hierarchical structure of these instances to get in contact with the handling officers, by first contacting the unit director or group leader.

3.3.2 Interviews

We carried out four individual interviews and five group interviews. Altogether we made nine interviews with thirteen interview persons. Three of the interview persons were men and ten of them women. One of the individual interviews was a discussion with the vignette[9] as a starting point and the three others were semi-structured interviews[10] with the director or the group leader of the different units. We did three group discussions with the vignette as a basis and with a following semi-structured interview. The vignette-based group discussions, three in its total, were each made with two persons working in the same unit, with similar or different tasks. We have been asking the same questions to each discussion group and also the individual vignette-based interview, even though the questions were not "relevant" nor touching the unit's activity. Out of the two other group interviews one was semi-structured and the other was improvised. We did an improvised interview because we took the chance, while we were already doing an interview at a unit.

---

[9] Appendix 1
[10] Appendix

At the House of Possibilities we met one group leader in an individual interview and one handling officer and one expert in a group discussion. At introduction team we met one group leader in an individual interview and two handling officers for a group discussion. At integrations service we met one program director and one social worker for an informative interview and secondly the same social worker individually for a discussion about the vignette cases. We also met two project leaders at the integration service that we held an informative and openly semi-structured interview with. At the unit of migration board we met the unit director in an individual interview and two handling officers in a group discussion about the vignette cases. Totally we realized nine interviews with thirteen persons; three of them have been group discussions based on our vignette cases, plus one individual vignette case discussion.

House of Possibilities
Group Leader I
Handling Officer III
Expert I

Introduction Team
Group Leader II
Handling Officer I and II

Integration Service
Group leader IIII
Project leader I,II and III

Migration Board
Group Leader III
Expert II
Handling Officer IIII

We gave our vignette cases with following questions to our interview persons before the discussion so that they would have some time to read and reflect over the cases before our meeting. We experienced that some of our interview persons did follow our questions, that where open questions; to inspire a reflection discussion, as if they where structured and fix. Our intention was to use the questions as a ground to start the discussion followed with follow up questions related to relevant information/reflections that would merge from the discussions. But this was in especially one group discussion interrupted by one participator. In another group discussion these questions were answered to in few words without any following discussion, which made the distance between these cases and the handling officers visible.

3.3.3 Presentation of authorities and programs

The Introduction Team works with introduction of refugees when they received permanent or temporary permits of residence. When needed, they work in contact and in cooperation with the social service unit. Integration service is a program under the development committee that is situated in the same building as Visions Centre, but it is a program developed directly by the politicians and it is not an authority. The Social Service Office is divided under two different committees[11] in the municipality of Helsingborg, the Social Committee and the Development Committee. The division between the committees is made between the handling of cash-benefits and other benefits/ support/ help. We choose to contact the social service offices under the development committee that are divided in two different units; that both work with cash-benefits and some housing questions, Visions Centre and House of Possibilities. The social services positioned under the development committee are divided in two different units that work with different target groups. The unit of social services positioned under Visions Centre works with persons that are closer to the labour market, as to say a person that are in need of a more temporary cash-benefit. Visions Centre provides different forms of education, work practices etc. (www.helsingborg.se). The unit House of Possibilities is working with the target group that are finding themselves longer away from the labour markets requirement or in need of rehabilitation, they work with advice and support with the end goal of all persons self-sufficiency (a.a.). We had one interview and one group discussion at the unit of the Swedish Migration Board in Helsingborg; that work over an area of 12 municipalities in the northwest of the region of Skåne.

3.3.4 Ethical reflections

We conducted interviews where the interview persons were expected to discuss a subject, which had, at a first sight, nothing to do with their working tasks. Thanks to the vignettes, we could lead the discussion to concern the position of undocumented migrants. Several of the interview persons expressed in different ways that some questions or some discussion subjects were too personal or too political, and they seemed like they did not want to continue. If they continued to talk, we did not stop them. In these situations the interview persons expressed feelings of irritation or/and uncertainty. Why didn't we end the discussion at that point? First, we agreed that the questions posed were personal and political, but we did not perceive that as an obstacle. From our point of view a person's position at work is both personal and political,

---

[11] Committee, translation into Swedish: nämnd

and therefore we never aimed to exclude those questions. On the other hand, we believe our objectives could have been described clearer in the invitation letter and also in the beginning of the interviews. Naturally, we did not aim to make it difficult to understand, but if the persons interviewed had known more exact what the thesis was about, they would have had a better chance to say no to participate. One ethical implications of this is that the interview person may interpret our analysis and examination of the material as opponent to their perception of the problematic situations discussed. The sociologist Pål Repstad argues that if the participant will find that the researcher does not pay attention to the interview person's interpretation, in a comparison between e.g. our conclusions and their perception; the research project will be dismissed (1992:91). Initially our ambition is to inspire and stimulate to reflections and discussion about ethical implications as a social worker in relation to undocumented migrants.

To add an ethical and methodological problem, the translation from Swedish to English, probably has concealed or erased some of the essence and nuances of our empirical material. We made the translations as accurate as possible, according to our skills in English.

3.3.5 On objectivity, the position of the researcher

Our position is interesting to bring up in the methodological process of defining hegemonic discourses. We do not stand on a neutral ground looking through objective lenses, when analysing the text. On the contrary, we are equally positioned by our experiences, different backgrounds and political standpoints. This is also true when it comes to participatory action research and vignette studies. The political philosopher Donna Haraway argues for a 'feminist objectivity' which contextualize the subject (Bhavnani, 1994:28). We understand Haraway's objectivity concept as a relative objectivity. In practice, when deconstructing a text and identifying hegemonic discourses, the importance of giving a context to our choice of perspectives and positions, leads to a better possibility for the reader to conclude if the text is credible or not. In the introduction we define some of our normative standpoints.

3.3.6 Reliability

As we mentioned in the part above, on objectivity, we find it relevant to illuminate our positions and how this reflects how we will elaborate and analyze the material in accordance with our theoretical framework. In a quantitative approach the reliability in a study is analysed

as dependant on that the measures are correctly done. To comprehend if the study would get the same result if two other "researchers" would have done the same study using the identical material, measurements and tools (Thurén: 1991:22). In a qualitative research with a methodological approach; focusing on the positions and experiences of the researchers the reliability becomes a question of a clear positioning of the researchers. Our interpretation is context bounded, to the situation were we realized our empirical research in Helsingborg, to the different interview persons we meet, to our participation and presence and to our pre-knowledge and approach in this study (Hydén and Lundberg, 2004: 30ff).

3.3.7 Validity

We ask us the question whether the vignette cases helped us to fulfil our objectives and make the study that we aimed to do. Our main objectives were to use the vignette cases as a way of directing the group discussion towards a matter (social problem) that we assumed would be defined by the authorities as outside their field of work. As a tool to reach our objectives; how the position and situation of undocumented migrants is discussed by social worker and handling officers within the authorities that we meet. Ulla Jegerby concludes that it is not possible to know if the assessment of the interview persons would have been the same with a real case in the use of vignettes. But the interesting outcome is that possible comparisons can be made between the different reflections and assessments because all the interview persons discussed the same cases (Jegerby: 1999:23) We asked the interview persons to what degree they could relate to the fictive cases, with cases from their own working practice. In general all of them could relate to the first vignette, but as we mentioned before, not the second. We found that the vignette case was a tool to reach validity in our study and the outcomes have been relevant and useful in some aspects.

First of all; to lead the discussion into reflections about undocumented migrants and different perceptions of their situation, even though many answers and discussions have stayed within the field of activity on each authority. Secondly our vignettes and the group discussion have been received positively and many of our interview persons did express that they found it interesting an important to have discussions and reflections with e.g. students making a research. Finally, a troublesome thought that has followed our process is the question; if we actually have observed the hegemonic discourses that we claim in our conclusion in our empirical material. Or if we already had a perception grounded in our theoretical framework and political standpoints and the sought for expressions of this in the material.

3.3.8 Limitations

Time limits, due to the required size and expected work with this bachelor thesis, made us perform some necessary reductions in our approach and objectives, during the whole working process. One already expressed example was our ambition to realize a discourse analysis. We found that we had enough empirical material to realize a discourse analysis but our limitation was, time restrictions and theoretical restrictions within a discourse analytic approach. Because we wanted to study how the hegemonic discourses that we observed in our material were legitimized and upheld within the authorities.

Another limitation is that we have not seen any work in practice in the authorities that we have visited; we have only heard the interview persons tell about their practical work. This is often a limitation seen in many studies though it could be argued that it is more credible and a more in-depth study to observe the actual practice of each authority.

We have not realized any interviews or group discussions at the social service office under the Vision centre, which would have been relevant though they as well as the House of possibilities work under the Social Service Act. Due to time limits for the bachelor thesis and a heavy workload at the Vision centre, because of coming transformations in the organization in the beginning of 2008, we did not manage to realize these interviews/group discussions. During the whole working process we asked each other for whom we wrote this thesis? Would it have been possible to realize a study that with more of a relevance for e.g. an organization that work and support undocumented migrants or to make a more informative study examining the staying concept from a juridical science approach? Our initial approach was to deepen the use of the staying concept and its different contingent interpretations. In addition the approach in this study became on a more abstract level; discussing exclusionary boundaries and citizenship.

3.3.9 Our cooperation

Our cooperation could be described as a rubber band; keeping us at the same track even though sometimes, one of us is dragging the other one at one direction and vice verse. Nevertheless, the band holds the symbol of teamwork that was inspired by many interesting discussions and laughing moments. We worked together during most of the whole working process, writing on different parts and later sharing, reading and discussing them. We made

all the interviews and group discussion together; what we found to be a very important part of the work. When we were writing the open questions together, we noticed a better depth of the interview and a better comprehension of our focus.

4. Analysis and Presentation of Empirical Material

The analysis is divided in three major chapters where we illustrate different aspects of how social workers at different state and municipal authorities and project discuss the position of undocumented migrants. Throughout our interviews and discussions the un-static and nonlinear character of the asylum seeking process became clearer. Many migrants go in and out from different legal positions in relation to the state before, under and after the asylum seeking process, the application for a work permit and the application of residence permit without asylum requisites. We see this as a process of being positioned as legal or 'illegal'.

4.1 Undocumented Migrants – It is not our problem

4.1.1 The relation between authorities and undocumented migrants

The situation of undocumented migrants is not described as a general social problem by the authorities and municipal projects in our interviews. When discussing this issue as a structural problem in a welfare state, for example how a situation with undocumented migrants constructs and reproduces, several interview persons indicate that this is a personal and a political question or expresses: 'now I leave my role as a professional'. Furthermore the situation of undocumented migrants is not defined as an organizational problem, concerning the activities of an authority.

> From our standpoint, the problem is not that widespread, but that's from an egoistic point of view. I believe it is relatively difficult to live illegally in Sweden. (Migration Board, Group leader III)

As Foucault state, a power relation can be concealed, by a practice that is presented and perceived as neutral or evident (Foucault: 1993:7). The quotation above is one of several that shows how the 'problem' with undocumented migrants is not a major problem from the authorities' point of view. This is said by an employee at the Migration Board in Helsingborg. The problem seems to be positioned outside our interview persons' area of work activities.

> Per definition, we do not stay in contact with undocumented migrants. (Migration Board, Group leader III)

The interview persons do confirm the existence of the undocumented migrants, but position the problem outside her/his organizational framework and position her/himself inside. Charles

Tilly argues that members of an organization learn how to safeguard the boundaries of its activities (1998:97). We define the social structure of an authority or a project as an organization. In this context, the interview persons learn what the boundaries are, or what they believe that the boundaries are. They draw a line between their area of competence and the 'the problem' of undocumented migrants. By incorporating the configuration of the organization, the interview persons gain an interest to safeguard the limits, the procedures and the practices within their working place. Tilly names the compass that makes it possible to understand and safeguard the configurations in an organization, for a script (Tilly, 2000:86ff). From our perspective a script decides which discursive positions in a net of power relations that is eligible and understandable within a practice.

> Group leader II comments upon the situation of immigrants that abscond from the Migration Board and the Police:
>
> I feel I don't want to make a judgement neither questioning their choices, on the contrary I believe they have taken a decision…In a way there will always be [undocumented migrants], this exists and people make their choices. They found a way of living and this will always exists. Ok, it is not a good thing to live underground, but as long as the situation do not change in the world then many persons live a better life as undocumented migrants than living in absolute poverty (Introduction Team, group leader II)

The group leader does not judge nor question the 'choice' to hide made by undocumented migrants. The group leader explains what s/he means with a choice made by the migrants. There are two opportunities presented to the migrants; to hide from the authorities or to live in absolute poverty. S/he accept the situation being and does not believe s/he is a part of that neither does s/he think there is something that can be done to change the conditions. Like the examples above the group leader positions her/himself in a seemingly neutral position, distanced from the question of undocumented migrants. In his text, Khosravi discusses the legalization of the process of illegality (SOU: 2006:37:s306). The process of illegality refers to a discourse where persons e.g. undocumented migrants, are reproduced as illegal, through the making and implementation of legislation and regulations. The acceptance of undocumented migrants 'choices' or the reduction of the 'problem' in the quotations above could be understood as a way to confirm the existence of undocumented migrants but at the same time contribute to the representation of undocumented migrants as illegal. Undocumented migrant's status of being illegal is reinforced in the discussion among our interview persons.

We argue that the situation of undocumented migrants is a concern of state authorities, municipal authorities and municipal projects. We have demonstrated how our interview

persons tend to place the question of undocumented migrants outside their field, even if there is an existing contact space. Handling officers, project leaders and group leaders meet clients that have been living clandestine and without documents in Sweden or clients that are in a situation where they might abscond from the authorities, because of a refused entry to Sweden.

> There are many persons disappearing in our world [during the asylum seeking process]. (Migration Board, Group leader III)

The quote indicates that they met before at the Migration Board, before the asylum seekers 'disappear'. All the interview persons confirm that they can relate to Farouk's general situation in the vignette (appendix I) from experiences in their work.

> Your first question if we can relate to the vignette in reality, yes we can, we can relate to most of it. We can relate to most of the questions. We do relate to all of our cases and adjust our actions thereafter. (Introduction Team, Handling Officer I)
>
> I believe we had a similar case in the social office, especially with the ones who were denied permanent residence and then were waiting for something, but I cannot remember that case. (House of Possibilities, Handling Officer III)

Farouk has a temporary residence permit, but later on he get a refusal on entry. The process to get a permanent residence permit or to get a refusal on entry to Sweden is not linear. Our interview persons confirm that from Farouk's first encounter with Swedish authorities in Helsingborg until he eventually abscond and in some cases even after the 'disappearance', he probably has several contacts with The Migration Board, the Integration Service, the House of Possibilities and the Introduction Team.

4.1.2 Safeguarding categorical boundaries, an ethical dilemma

It is relevant to highlight the social relation between the state and the group of undocumented migrant. The hierarchic power relation reproduces by, for example, the interview persons working at an authority and their clients. Even though the relation is hierarchic, it can be perceived as both personal and emphatic, by Project Leaders, Handling Officers etc.

> Interviewer: You become very committed to these persons when meeting them all the time.
> That is true. I meet them, but the Migration Board does not, it must be difficult for them to get the whole picture. (Integration Service, Project Leader I)

Even if there exist regulations, excluding undocumented migrants from social services, the categorical boundaries defining the limits of different actions taken by an authority or within a

project, are not clear or fix. Several statements of our interview persons illuminate that the boundaries are negotiable to some extent, which we mean, leave the interview persons free to interpret how the activities of the organization shall be limited; accordingly there is a space how to shape the relation with the client.

> They told us themselves that we are like sisters and mothers to them. They do not have any other contacts here in Sweden, often they do not have anyone to turn to and then they swear. They say. You are my Handling Officer …and you must help me. Who will help me and take care of me otherwise? (Introduction Team, Handling Officer II)

In the example above the question, what is personal and what is professional in relation to a client, is raised. The clients compare the relation to the Handling Officer with a family bound, which, if we understand the Handling Officer right, is not a mutual understanding of the relation. The position of the clients is subordinated to the position of the Handling Officer, which is clarified when the Handling Officer form a picture of the clients as a group dependent on her/his help, though they do not know where to turn to if they will not receive help from here. The power relation, due to the client's and the Handling Officer's different positions, affects the outcome of contingent relations.

When holding a position as a decision maker and equally as a bureaucrat that interpret regulations and legislation, we believe an ethical responsibility comes along. This power of interpretation is called discretional power. Lennart Lundquist professor in political science brings up a normative perspective on the responsibility of the bureaucrat. The position as a bureaucrat means, due to Lundquist, not exclusively to implement political decisions, but also to protect democratic values and act as role models in the society (Lundquist: 1998:72f).

In the vignette, Farouk says that he is going to commit suicide, after he has been refused on getting an entry in Sweden. The event raises questions about the structure of the organization. What is considered to be the tasks of the so-called bureaucrats? Where do they position and draw the line, in a situation where a client threatens of committing suicide, a situation with ethical implications about life and death? The interview persons discuss below what the responsibilities in a similar situation are and what actions they can take:

> …If he really meant to commit suicide he would have done it long time ago. When you talk in details of how to commit a suicide, normally that's a cry for help, but it should never be neglected…This is a person desperately in need for help. In the role as a social worker or as a doctor you must take your time and listen to him. (Introduction Team, Handling Officer III)

The responsibility in this case, is discussed from the social worker's professional perspective. The suicide is seen as a cry for help. The need to be met, says the Handling Officer, is first of all to be listen to. The Handling Officer does not reflect upon the decision made which results in Farouk's difficult situation. Why does he want to commit suicide? In the empirical material, we note that several interview persons reflect and think about Farouk's statement to commit suicide but chose not to discuss the alternatives that is left for him if he stay alive.

A project leader has experienced when a client tried to commit suicide.

> It is said that a person that share her thoughts of committing suicide do not carry it out, but I don't know. Once I had a woman [client] she confessed to me that she was going to commit suicide, and then …Please turn the recorder off! (Integration Service, Project Leader I)

The 'rule' mentioned above, that if a person share her/his thought about committing suicide, is questioned by the Project Leader. The interview persons often receive personal confessions. When it comes to suicide, the situation becomes difficult to handle. Do you have to leave the role as bureaucrat to help the person? What is your responsibility?

> …exactly this is not our responsibility. It is a terrible when they threaten to commit suicide if they do not get a permanent residence permit or if their families are not allowed to come here [Sweden]. Then we have to draw the line and explain that we do our best but we are not in a position to take these decisions…Many of them they throw…maybe not as dramatic as to commit suicide, but for example if they do not get a job…then they threaten us and tell us what they are going to do and we keep on telling them that you do have a responsibility for your life, as well. (Integration Service, Project leader I)

When a migrant positions 'on the wrong side of the border' as an anti-citizen, in Farouk's case he is on his way to loose his legal right to stay in Sweden, the social worker marks that s/he can not help him, any longer. Above, the Project leader, point out the individual responsibility of the client. This might be a way to legitimate the power relation. The social worker is following a script that excludes non-citizens. S/he has a position from where s/he safeguards the categorical boundary that decides who is considered to be legal and who is considered to be illegal. A boundary is categorical when it creates two categories and keeps them apart.
From Tilly's concept of categorical inequality it is possible to interpret the maintenance and the framing of the categorical relation between the categories included and the ones excluded (1998:85f). The authority's practice when defining a client's eligibility forms and maintains this categorical relation. The categorical boundary is being reproduced when people are positioned as illegal, and denied some of her/his social rights. In Farouk's case he risks to be refused social assistance e.g. cash benefits and physiological support. The core activity of an

authority that is set to work with citizens and persons with a legal status in Sweden destabilizes if the boundaries of the authorities working field are challenged.

One aspect of exploitation is the exclusion of a group of persons from important resources. Tilly underlines that categorical inequality facilitates exploitation (1998:88). In our example the clients get assistance as long as they have a status of being Swedish citizens or a legal non-citizen. When they are being positioned as undocumented migrants they are excluded from social service. It is easier, according to Tilly, for an authority to resign and neglect a non- eligible client if a categorization already exists of a subordinated group, where this person could be positioned (1998:88). A categorization that excludes undocumented migrants from being defined as citizen makes an expression, like *"per definition we do not work with undocumented migrants"* legitimate. The undocumented migrants are not legally staying here and from the authorities point of view it is not their field of responsibility. To sum up, the process of categorization of undocumented migrants positions them as anti-citizens. A process that could be illuminated as a clear reduction of the undocumented migrant's possibilities to contact different municipality authorities, applying for support/assistance. The undocumented migrant's position as an anti-citizen makes it natural for authorities to put the ethical responsibility of a structural problem on the individual migrant, even when it comes to threats like committing suicide.

4.2 Legal attributes and citizenship

4.2.1 The Framing and maintenance of boundaries

From our empirical material we find it interesting to focus on the legal attributes that have been explicitly used by our interview persons as central to define if the person is staying in the municipality legally or 'illegally'. While focusing on, by Lister defined, the exclusionary boundary of citizenship it is important to illuminate some of the existing legal attributes that actually form the border, or uses the physical body of the 'illegal' migrant as the boundary. This could also be seen as an illustration of a legalization of the process of migrant 'illegality' (Khosravi: SOU 2006:37: s306).

These legal attributes can be explained as a physical expression of a script, as a status and as a position that is upheld by the immigration law and policy, through the processes of

implementation of these laws and also through the social service act's existing criteria's and requisites. The legal attributes that we found interesting to explore was; national registration, permanent or temporary resident permit, the holding of documents/ papers, the "four last" numbers in the social security number and the physical staying in the municipality, which implies the need to show/prove that.

The legal attributes are demonstrated while discussing the status and possibilities of undocumented migrants to get in contact with the social service. The laws that are being used and interpreted, within the activity of our interview person's daily work are the Social Service Act (SoL), the Alien Act (UtlL) and the Alien Act regulation (UtlF). The staying concept according to the Social Services Act 2§, which gives the municipality the outmost responsibility, is our central focus.

The core of the legal attributes around which our interview persons centre their discussion, is the national registration. It is not possible to be registered if one does not have a residence permit or another legal status as e.g. European citizen. In addition, when a person gets a residence permit s/he will receive a social security number that makes her/him possible to register.

> If you are not allowed to stay in the country, then you can not be registered (Introduction team, Group leader II)

> Essentially, if a person does not have a resident permit s/he does not have the right to stay (House of Possibilities, Expert I)

Group leader II expresses this in the context of the complication of not being able to register if a person does not have a social security number, which follows the implication of a legal status or some kind of document stating your position, as a 'legal' non-citizen or as a denizen. At the House of Possibilities they conclude, 's*trictly juridical'*, that a person who:

> (…) does not have the right to stay in the country, does not have any social rights according to SoL. They can contact the migration board; they took the decision and should take the responsibility (House of Possibilities, Expert I)

In the House of Possibilities, as being a social service office, all three interview persons seemed at first to have a clear definition of that a person lacking legal rights in the country is not eligible for any form of social assistance. This quotation shows a strict definition. The 'they' in the quotation above refers to the former client that is advised to contact the migration

board. Note that it was the Migration Board that took the decision not the House of Possibilities, where the quoted expert works. In the interviews the categorical boundary that separate the categorical pair, citizen and non-citizen, becomes somewhat negotiable. For example both the expert and the group leader bring a book, concerning cash-assistance, the Alien act and the Social Service Office's responsibilities. After a further discussion, none of them were certain of how to interpret and implement these laws. The interview persons explained that the question was new for them.

The implications of the staying concept for undocumented migrants are seen as a problem that is not 'ours' and the interview persons direct the consequences to the authorities that took the decision. By doing that they safeguarded the boundaries of responsibility and obligations that belonged to the authority, where they worked themselves. None of our interview persons at the House of Possibilities underline the outmost responsibility of the municipality when it comes to undocumented migrants in relation to the staying concept. The uncertainty is referred to as the lack of actual knowledge or as a political responsibility and a political decision. It was also referred to as the consequences of actions taken by other authorities. The social service office interact by providing benefits according to the emergency concept, which means a ticket to the embassy, food for the couple of days or emergency housing support for families; but the latter requires legal attributes.

One legal attribute that is used by our interview persons are '*the last four*' numbers in the social security number. As we mentioned above the national registration and the holding of a social security number is a core attribute that shapes a persons visibility within the system. A common way of expressing the national registrations importance by our interview persons is use the 'bureaucratic slang'; '*the last four*'. These numbers are symbolically the line between participation and the right to proclaimed social, civil and legal rights in Sweden. The use of the social security number as identification for control and limit setting is grounded in the bureaucratic system of state authorities, activities and services.

> You have to be nationally registered, to be that you need the "four last" (numbers; a social security number) or you need a residence permit. (House of Possibilities, Group leader 1)

At first, group leader I is not certain if it is possible to have 'the four last' without a residence permit, but at the end of the interview s/he underlines after a while that it is not possible to get 'the four last' numbers if one does not have a permit.

> If one has a permit, then s/he will have the "four last" and consequently the right to apply for social service and cash-benefits in the municipality where the person is registered (House of Possibilities, Handling officer III)

> It is a problem for us if the person is missing the four last numbers (House of Possibilities, Handling officer III)

In this case the Social Service Office will have to investigate if the person has been in contact with the migration board and if s/he is waiting for a decision and they will look further into the status of that decision. If there is no application in with at the migration board then s/he could only direct the person there, or if there is a decision of rejection then it is a case for the migration board and the police. So in both cases s/he would direct the person to the migration board. If the client does not have food and a place to live the House of Possibilities refers to the 'emergency concept', which implies some cash-assistance for a day or two up to one week.

4.2.2 Citizenship and exclusion

To be eligible for cash-benefit or other social services as an adult person, one has to demonstrate ones legal status as a citizen. The undocumented migrant is excluded from a major part of social service and they find themselves in a dependant position towards the state. The discourse of 'illegality' and the creation of the space of non-existence inhibit persons without a legal status from participating and acting within the society, e.g. the labour market (De Genova: 2002:427). It is possible to relate this position in society as a form of exploitation, upheld by the categorical relations between the citizen and the "illegal" non-citizen.

Our interview persons categorize citizens:

> From our point of view, they [denizens] should be treated like other citizens. (House of Possibilities, Handling Officer III)

The quotation above represents migrants with a temporarily residence permit as other citizens, compared to Swedish citizens. To describe this phenomenon we use the term denizen, as conceptualized by Hammar (1999:175) and Lister (2003:49). The denizenship is elaborated in our theoretical framework as a middle stage between a citizen and an alien, and as a conceptualization of a fragile and conditioned legal status.

It is interesting to bring the denizen-status to the division; to be and to act as a denizen, as Lister elaborates in a discussion about citizenship (1998:5). To be a denizen status implies some proclaimed social and civil rights, but not political rights. In addition, to act as a denizen is conditioned by e.g. structural discrimination and discretional power of handling officers. The quotation above presents that denizenship might be conditioned and that the degree of inclusiveness is elaborated. Handling officer III found it relevant to categorize and illuminate their different status, even though the differentiation is said with a positive connotation; of equal treatment. The categorization and comparison is illustrative as a making of the 'other' in comparison to 'us'. S/he underlines the substantive rights of denizens, but does also show the conditioning of these rights.

Expert I refer to the necessary papers one always has to bring while applying at the Social Service Office. The legal status has to be documented and possible to demonstrate. If a person is waiting for the Migration Board's decision to get an entry to Sweden, under that period they are not eligible of social assistance from Social Service Office. According to expert I, this means the applicant are under the responsibility of the Migration Board. The interview person also refers to persons that have applied for a permit through attachment-family-bounds. As long as the applicant waits for the residence permit they are under the responsibility of the person that s/he claim is family. Therefore interview person expresses, they do not have the right to claim social assistance, because they stay here in Helsingborg without the right to be there. The interview person would not personally inform the police if a person stays here illegal. S/he adds:

> If the person has a decision to refuse entry, then we will have to direct the person to (…) well if it is the police or the migration board (House of Possibilities, Expert I).

In this quotation there is an actual acceptance of that the person's physical body, de facto, is staying in Helsingborg. But the person in the example is lacking legal attributes that would change her/his excluded position and possibilities to act, participate and reclaim rights within this place in relation to the state. If the person stays here "illegal" and is in acute need of e.g. money for food and housing s/he concludes that they have the possibility to provide acute assistance according to the *"emergency concept",* but *"we do not have the obligation to"* (House of possibilities, expert I).

The exclusion of undocumented migrants decided by the positioning of them as 'illegal' can be one way of analyzing the construction of the status ant-citizen. As Khosravi states the anti-citizen is perceived as a problem, in contrast to its categorical opponent, the citizen (SOU 2006:37:s300). Tilly stresses that sharply drawn boundaries between those who are within and those without and justify unequal treatment of those who are excluded (1998:88). When the interview persons position undocumented migrants as anti-citizens, they make it easier to distance themselves from a reasonability to provide social assistance, which undermine the social rights of undocumented migrants.

4.3 Among 'other' citizens: Denizens and anti-citizens

The discussion about housing among authorities and municipal integration programs in Helsingborg are of interest because it clearly represents the making of the migrants as 'the others'. If migrants are reproduced as 'the others', undocumented migrants are being in visualized as non-existence or as anti-citizens. There is a scale citizen-denizen-anti-citizen and non-existent, where the processes of exploitation and stigmatization reinforce the weaker position of undocumented migrants. The housing problem, the temporary residence permit and the space of non-existence illustrate this scale.

Citizenship can be seen as operating as an exclusionary status, as a sharp separation between the included and the excluded, excluding the non-citizen from citizen based rights and state controlled/provided benefits as both Tilly (1998:88f) and Lister (2003:44ff) concludes. This exclusionary separation is operating in different dimensions, for example by the existence of temporary or permanent residence permit and the different positions an asylum seeker, a denizen, an undocumented migrant or an anti-citizen have in relation to the state. While Tilly illustrates this exclusion as a form of exploitation, Lister refers to the degree of inclusiveness and substantive citizenship due to different social divisions. Lister illustrates the degree of inclusiveness as a hierarchical model, where undocumented migrants stand outside and under the bottom of the model, physically excluded from the territory and all its associated rights (2003:44ff). In relation to the degree of inclusiveness both formally and substantively we conceptualize a scale of exclusion, to illuminate the exclusionary process of citizenship (a. a.). According to the housing discussion in Helsingborg refugees and other clients in need of a place to stay seem to be divided in two groups.

> /.../ and it is not only the refugees that are an actual target group for housing but there are other clients without a place to stay /.../ there is a risk that they will be compared, who do we pity the most or where is the greatest need of assistance /.../ At the same time the politicians argue that there must be accommodation available for the general population moving to the city, at the same time as there is a new establishment of businesses (House of Possibilities, Group leader I).

There is a categorization made, in the quotation above, between the general populations that expects to generate incomes while establishing new businesses compared with refugees; that might not do that. We would like to highlight this categorization as a shaping of "the other" with a set of norms of how "we", the citizens; have rights and possibilities to mobility. The migrant is set aside by the, group leader I's, statement in the political debate on housing. This could be analyzed as a question of prioritising the economical costs between citizens and the non-citizens.

4.3.1 The housing problem and the exclusion of migrants from municipal resources

There is a general understanding that many migrants prefer Helsingborg before other cities. Helsingborg is said to have a good reputation. The popularity of Integration Service in Helsingborg among migrants is associated in the quotation below with high expectations and a pressure on the employees. Threats seem to be a consequence, when the social worker cannot live up to the expectations of their clients.

> Somehow Integration Service has received a reputation in Helsingborg; many persons come to us and say that 'we know that you can help immigrants here'. It feels good to be represented in this way on the one hand, but on the other hand they [clients] expect too much from us. This is the reason why we have an alarm even if we are no authorities, but we are vulnerable for threat anyway. (Integration Service, Project leader I)

A problem clearly confirmed by the interview persons, is that the problem of housing appear to be relatively new. The amount of migrants has increased, which makes it more difficult to find accommodation. Several interview persons bring up a discussion about placing asylum seekers in the whole country according to a division system. When applying for asylum in Sweden a person can according to the *ebo-law[12]* choose two different forms of accommodation; to live in a refugee-centre or to find one's own accommodation during the whole asylum-process. The law is illustrated as a choice that can be made at the initial process. At the same time the Migration Board has the obligation to provide all asylum seekers with accommodation (Migration Board, Group leader III).

---

[12] Ebo-lagen, lagen om Eget boende

Actually, it is like this that the staying concept is rather problematic to us. Because, thanks to the ebo-law, many refugees choose to settle in especially five municipalities in Sweden and these are carrying a heavy load. Helsingborg is the fifth of these municipalities /.../ It creates big problems in some municipalities, in some parts of Sweden. One ought to find a solution and divide the refugees more even between different regions (Introduction Team, Handling officer I).

The group leader at the Migration Board underlines that they would prefer if as many asylum seekers as possible lived at different refugee centres, run and controlled by the Migration Board to ensure the living standards of the accommodations and divide the costs between the municipalities. The present situation does not allow this.

The only demand we can make is that the person is reachable; we can not perform any control (Migration Board, Group leader III).

Even if a person is reachable and registered at a specific address, it is difficult for the authorities to know where s/he is staying physically.

We cannot prove that because everyone has got cell phones today. If they only had a stationary home phone or something, then we would have known if they lived in Helsingborg. Now they just live a little bit here and a little bit there/.../ (House of Possibilities, handling officer III)

We find it interesting to highlight that the interview person at the Migration Board would prefer to see as many asylum seekers as possible to live in refugee centres, which is a clear statement; with the attempt to control the placement of asylum seekers in Sweden.

The problem as we see it is that the municipality of Helsingborg does not handle it [the housing problem], and that no other municipality, to any significant extent, takes the responsibility. Many asylum seekers want to live in Helsingborg and surroundings but there is inertia to receive asylum seekers./.../ (Migration board, group leader III).

As shown by the quotation below this is of interest for both the municipalities and the state. Politicians are involved in the problem that many define as 'beyond' the responsibility of bureaucrats.

The chairman of the local development committee is very active in this question. He has had discussions with the government and with the migration minister around the question about the ebo-law and the existing possibilities to chose. It is not serving the interest of the individual because; as long as one does not have the housing situation solved it is hard to get going with the introduction. /…/ Of course is it also a question about imbalance between municipalities (House of Possibilities, group leader I).

The ebo-law in itself is described as problematic, among other things because of the decrease in control where asylum seekers temporarily settle. Group leader III, also underlines that

housing is a political conflict and stresses; *"that it is a question on how harsh we want the solution to be"*.

A relevant aspect of this discussion is the economical costs and the state control over mobility and settlements of migrants, which seems to be the core focus in the debate and in expressions above. If the asylum-seeker can choose where they want to live, the risk is big that they will become a burden for some municipalities increases, and not a burden for the state. It can also be seen as it becomes harder for both the Migration Board and the Municipality to control if someone abscond at a sooner or later stage from the asylum seeking process or afterwards. There seem to be a tendency to exclude asylum-seekers and migrants with residence permit from municipal resources. This could be expressed as a form of exploitation, due to Tilly's definition of exploitation as a kind of exclusion from resources (1998:88). The municipality redirects their responsibility towards the state demanding a more even division of migrants between all municipalities. From an individual's rights perspective this could be analyzed as a restriction of rights and material resources necessary to manage and handle the situation arriving in a new country. One resource could be existing networks of contacts that may be the migrant's reason to choose to live in a specific city.

4.3.2 Networks and opportunity hoarding

If the asylum seeker follows the Migration Board's placements according to available housing at refugee centres, s/he could take a risk to be placed far away from networks of contacts/relatives. The existing networks and contacts when arriving to Sweden is commonly described as a problem, though this will often lead to the choice of staying at a certain place, which indicates less control for the Migration Board and the Municipal authorities. Existing networks around the migrant are described as an explanation why many of them choose to settle in Helsingborg, which is seen as problematic.

> /.../ they want to be registered here. It is better reimbursement here, better education in Swedish language for immigrants (SFI), they have there friends here but they do not have a place to sleep /.../ but they are registered here. And this ebo-law is complicating the situation, not as long as they are alone, but many of these refugees that are here alone have their families left in Iraq. When they arrive then it becomes more untenable. (Introduction Team, Group leader II)

In one example the networks and social contacts of the client is experienced as a positive. The positive aspects of networks here emphasize the importance of a network when it comes to the social development of a family.

> /.../ and then we involve persons around this family, which generates a good effect; though it gives some positive input and contributes for the development of this family. (House of Possibilities, Handling officer III)

According to the interview persons the clients are networking to get important information from each other, that is useful when they negotiate with the authorities. The networks make it possible to create an opportunity to claim accommodation.

> I mean, right now, eighty percent of our conversions circulate round negotiations about housing, in spite of the information they get from the Migration Board, that it is their [asylum seekers] own choice to stay in a city with housing problems /.../ (Introduction Team, Handling officer I)

One answer to the question why the clients negotiate is that negotiating is significant of a culture different from the Swedish culture.

> In their case, a lot of things are about negotiating. They want to negotiate about almost everything, from the economical issues to questions concerning housing and about going to school or not. I suppose it is their culture...I don't know. (Introduction Team, Handling officer II)

We have seen throughout our material the significance of a network of contacts for an undocumented migrant and her/his possibilities to hide and to find a place to live and to earn a living. It can be analyzed according to Tilly (1998:91) as a small, but significant opportunity hoarding both for the undocumented migrant's possibilities to find a place to stay and for the denizens, which are denied support to find housing. Excluded persons that do not have access to social assistance can by hoarding opportunities reach some possibilities to move within the society. Personal networks and/or contacts with organizations and churches etc. create more possibilities to stay after a refused entry to Sweden, but also during a complicated asylum-process. We argue that this opportunity hoarding creates a necessary security for undocumented migrants, who are in need of a place to stay. From this point of view the authorities' loose control and their power position is disturbed by networks of friends, families, social movements and organizations.

The discussion of the municipalities demand for control and the exploitation by the negation of municipal resources can be related to a process of stigmatization of migrants. The migrants face a lack of support and assistance, which partly could be seen as a consequence of the categorization of 'them' and ' their culture' as problematic and different from Swedish culture. The stigmatization is expressed both presupposing that something in their culture is different

from the societal consensus of how one contact an authority, how one arrange accommodation and ones living conditions. As for example in expressions of misunderstandings or actions that are unlike the norms of a 'Swedish' citizen; as negotiating or the emphasis on the existence of social networks. The stigma placed on the migrant in contact with the authority can be seen as a power action in accordance with Foucault's conceptualization of stigmatization (Mulinari, de los Reyes: 2004:43). The housing situation for new-coming migrants could be one example of how a process of stigmatization reinforces a process of exploitation.

4.3.3 The individual's responsibility

None of the authorities in our study define the shortage of housing as their responsibility, except for an acute interaction, especially for families, by the House of possibilities. The quotation below illustrates a focus on the responsibility of the individual.

> Farouk[13] does not have any chance to get help with housing. By being placed in a municipality one is signing the conditions under which one have chose, they sign that they have chosen to live in Helsingborg and that they have said no to a place in another municipality where there would have been housing available. By that, they give up their right to get assistance (Introduction Team, Handling officer I).

In the quotation above the handling officers say that if the clients choose to live in Helsingborg, despite the shortage of housing in the city, they have given up the right to assistance. We understand this as if it is the migrant's own responsibility to find a place to stay.

> We say, no, no, no /.../ and especially if you are alone, you are your own responsibility and you received a residence permit while living on an address (Introduction Team, Group leader II)

At the introduction team, a discussion about the actual problems is described in terms of deliberating their responsibility in the housing question. They define the main problem to be the uneven municipality placing and the existence of the ebo-law. Like the other authorities they position the responsibility of the housing situation on the individual.

> Despite the information they have received from the migration board, they chose to settle in a city where there are mayor problems with lack of housing (Introduction Team, Handling officer I)

---

[13] Se appendix vignette 1, fas 1. From a discussion about our vignette cases at the introduction team.

At the House of Possibilities one focus the importance to separate an acute need and a long-term need, concerning the question of housing.

> One has to separate an application for housing benefits and support for an apartment is nothing that falls under SoL, roof over your head is another question. One cannot reclaim that I want three rooms and kitchen (…) and, unfortunately it is many that, as we said, they cannot separate…what is the acute part and what is the prolonged need and plans (House of Possibilities, Expert I).

As the House of Possibilities work in accordance with the Social Service Act (SoL) they cannot deny a person to apply for acute help, but they also refer to the lack of access to apartment as a limitation of their ability to support. The Introduction Team discuss the responsibility concerning the shortage of housing in relation to other authorities, but also to clients that want them to take responsibility of something they define as outside their field of work.

> Then one has to explain, again, that we are not housing agents and we have never been that. I have to explain this to other authorities all the time; it is hard (Introduction Team, Handling officer II).

As we were informed by the authorities interviewed, no one think of themselves to be in a position where they can help their clients to find housing. The effect of this standpoint, as we understand, is that it is the responsibility of the individual to find a place to stay.

> We use to say that there are problems that we can solve and problems that we cannot solve, and we ought to focus on the problems that we can solve" (Introduction Team, Handling officer I)

The individual holds a great responsibility in the view of many of our interview persons which seems to become like an alibi while discussing responsibility. The problems that the Introduction Team handles are the ones they can solve; this boundary setting outlines an interesting connotation. Who will define what problems are solvable within the boundaries of the authority? The authority itself, the municipal goals or the social policy shaped by the implementation of the immigration laws? The handling officers at the Introduction Team safeguard the boundaries of their organization by defining which problems they cannot solve as for example the housing situation.

4.3.4 Positioned as non-existent

When discussing the relation between the municipalities' outmost responsibility and how to interpret the staying concept, the undocumented migrants are repeatedly described as non-

existing or as not registered and therefore not staying here. Undocumented migrants are physically here and have needs to make a living, find housing etc, but are not proclaimed any rights. Khosravi defines this position as an inclusionary exclusion (Khosravi: 2006:37:s287).

> But one is always registered, not the undocumented migrants because they do not actually exist here, they are not registered because the do not have a residence permit /…/ But you and me, I guess. We are registered on an address as the majority, but if you are homeless you could be registered at a parish (House of Possibilities, Group leader I)

Another similar expression is made by the introduction team;

> /…/ when somebody is going underground, yes, then they do not exist and if they then come back then one have to look for; where were you registered before? (Introduction Team, Group leader II)
.

The Group Leader refers to a person that have had a temporary permission and then got her/his second application for prolonged permit residence refused. In this case the group leader search for a common denominator, within the system, *"where was the person registered before*?" These quotations could be analyzed, as if these persons do not exists because they have not the right to stay, according to the boundaries of these two authorities' defined responsibilities and activities. De Genova (2002:427) refers in his article to SB Coutin's concept; the 'space of non-existence'. He stresses according to SB Coutin, that the expression of official negation of an undocumented migrant's presence because of their 'illegality', in contradiction to their actual physical and social presence shapes a "space of non-existence" (a.a.). It is possible to analyze these expressions of non-existence as if the undocumented migrant is not visible in within the framings of responsibility made by the authorities'. The existing body is invisible through the curtains of laws, regulations, and divisions of responsibility and definitions of the same within the authorities. The different dimensions of exclusion can be analyzed as connected to the degree of legal status/position. If a person is completely excluded from all social, civil and legal rights, that are being territorialized within a countries borders; but still de facto is staying in the country; s/he becomes non-existing from the views of different state authorities. This could be analyzed as a neglecting of the exclusionary process that excludes undocumented migrants from e.g. social services. All everyday activities become 'illegalized' in the space of non-existence, housing, work and physical mobility (Khosravi: 2006:294). The existence in a space of non-existence does not position the undocumented migrant as an anti-citizen per se. It is when the undocumented migrant comes in contact with an authority or when an economical problem appears; that the positioning as an anti-citizen occurs.

One example of this is visualized while discussing our vignettes and especially Farouk's case; as his application for a prolonged residence permit gets rejected, a revelation of a responsibility conflict between the authorities occurs (appendix I). When a denizen, with a temporary permit gets her/his renewal application rejected by the Migration Board, the municipality defines the responsibility to lie on the Migration Board until the person leaves the country. The Migration Board in turn describe that they are the municipality's responsibility, until the refusal to entry can be put into effect. The Introduction Team refers to the Migration Board's responsibility of these persons though they examined the case and made the decision;

> /.../ it is unclear with those who have received a temporary permit /.../ This have been a little bit unclear, this with the temporary residence permits, because the municipality have considered if the permit is expired, especially if they have received a refusal to entry decision, then we consider that they should go under the Migration Boards responsibility. But the Migration Board regard that the municipality have the outmost responsibility /…/ we in Helsingborg have decided that we stop them in the introduction and then refer to the social service office where they can apply according to the emergency concept (Introduction Service, Group leader II).

The Group Leader refers to the Migration Board's responsibility and even though they have some guidelines within the municipality how to act in these cases s/he does not relate to the municipalities outmost responsibility as a base of their field of work. In the case of temporary residence permit a person that have been eligible in the activity within e.g. the Introduction Team becomes, by a refused decision, non-eligible and cut off the activity of introduction. If we apply Lister's concept of different degrees of inclusiveness (2003:44ff) this is a clear line of how a person looses her/his legal attributes and form the position as a denizen. The exclusion of denizens is to some extent a responsibility problem, where the rights to apply cash-benefits are unclear and where the emergency concept is not regulated by law other than in the staying concept defining the municipalities outmost responsibility, 2§ Social Service Act. One dialogue between the expert and the handling officer at the House of Possibilities illuminates this unclearness:

> Expert I: Yes, then one could say the emergency concept, actually.
> Handling officer III: But one could not manage on the emergency concept a longer time.
> Expert I: No, it is exactly like that, after a while it is not possible. If one does not get a whole national regulated cash-norm.

It is not possible to manage with a benefit according to the emergency concept a longer time, but until the deportation can be realized the person have to stay here in the country. The

authorities describe this situation from the perspective on the responsibility conflict between the municipality and the Migration Board. At the Integration Service another perspective is illuminated relating to the temporary residence permit;

> It is a kind of torture /.../It is better if we say no or yes from the beginning; instead of making the individual establish itself and learn about Sweden, maybe the individual will cut all contacts and possibilities to live in her/his former home /.../ then the possibility to return; it becomes impossible (Integration Service, Project leader II)

This quotation demonstrates an interpretation from the individual's position; at the categorical boundary of becoming "illegal" if s/he stays in the country after the decision of refusal to entry. A quotation that brings up a perspective on the temporary residence permit to be a kind of prolonged uncertainty; that could be seen as a weakening of the position as a denizen.

Even if the person voluntarily leaves the country after a refusal to entry or a deportation is realized, the time until the departure the individual's possibility to contact the Social Service Office and apply for cash-assistance according to the emergency concept is unclear. It is defined as a problematic situation and there is not a clear perception at the different authorities of how to act in these cases. It is expressed at the House of Possibilities that it is hard for the client to manage only with the emergency concept based benefit. The former denizen is staying on an unclear boundary between the former position as a legal non-citizen and a refused prolonged residence permit. This space is created as a consequence of unclear boundaries of responsibilities between the municipality and the Migration board. This space in between can be analyzed as a movement further out on the scale of exclusion. It is possible to define this process as a shaping of an anti-citizen.

The expression of the non-existing position or the space in between authorities responsibilities, where the former denizens that lost their temporary residence permit ends up, illuminates the authorities part in the exclusionary process. This is an expression of the actual practice where undocumented migrants are being excluded and positioned as illegal. We conclude that this is a matter that is not interpreted to be the responsibility of the authorities. Therefore the matter is invisualized which pronounce the representation of undocumented migrants as non-existent (De Genova: 2002:425).

5. Conclusion

In the essay we have studied how municipal project and municipal and state authorities discuss the position of undocumented migrants. The concept of citizenship has been analyzed in relation to undocumented migrants. We state that the material collected illustrates a hegemonic discourse of legality and 'illegality' that reproduces undocumented migrants as 'illegal'. 'Illegal'; in the sense that undocumented migrants cannot claim civil, political and social rights; because they do not have the right to stay in Sweden. Rights are territorialized.

To pinpoint the discourses of legality and 'illegality' we have highlighted the process that position undocumented migrants as 'illegal'. We argue that the handling officers and group leaders we have interviewed maintain and reproduce a hegemonic discourse of 'illegality' that invisualizes the situation of undocumented migrants. To outline the hegemonic discourse of 'illegality' we have throughout our theoretical framework been elaborating with different concepts to further illuminate different dimensions of citizenship.

Though our empirical material is limited to a few interviews at different authorities in Helsingborg, we do not claim to generalize from the interviews. From the fragments of a socially constructed reality we try to identify interesting patterns and themes and associate them with a more general context.

The social rights that we have been referring to from our empirical material are cash-benefits and the exclusion from municipal and state resources. We are aware of the restrictiveness in the material and do not claim to define all social rights, but find that the discussion about access to social service and assistance is important. We found that undocumented migrants to a great extent and denizens to some extent are excluded from their social rights with a standpoint in the theoretical framework and in our empirical material. Even if undocumented migrants stay in the municipality of Helsingborg they seem not to have the right to social services, according to the Social Service Act.

We argue that there is a scale of exclusion depending on the status of the citizenship. We have described the scale: citizen, denizen, anti-citizen and additionally a status of non-existence. This scale of different degrees of exclusion conditions the social rights for undocumented migrants and for migrants with temporary and permanent residence permit. That has been

examined in the discussion about the ebo-law, the housing shortage and the discussion about a rejected prolonged temporary residence permit.

Undocumented migrants are positioned by our interview persons as anti-citizens and as non-existent. The hierarchical categorization of undocumented migrants and denizens as the others enables an exploitation of them. To categorize undocumented migrants as the others could be seen as part of a stigmatization process. Stigmatization facilitates by exploitation and vice versa. The subordinated position of undocumented migrants as anti-citizens is shaped by processes of exploitation and stigmatization.

None of the authorities that we have interviewed takes the responsibility to proclaim the social rights of undocumented migrants. We interpret some different ways in which the authorities position undocumented migrants as anti-citizen. The way of positioning undocumented migrants outside the organization of an authority could be analyzed as one way of safeguarding their authority's boundaries of responsibility. An anti-citizen stands in a categorical relation with a citizen. Between them there is a categorical boundary that the authorities refer to when defining who is within and who is without their field of work. They are in need of the categorical boundary to safeguard their organizational boundary of responsibility. We claim that the categorization of the undocumented migrant as without the right to stay in the country is a positioning of the migrant as an anti-citizen. The authorities define that it is the individual's choice to stay 'illegally' and therefore her/his own responsibility. We interpret this conclusion as a description of that the undocumented migrant as being the problem itself, in the position of an anti-citizen. We argue that undocumented migrants position as an anti citizen makes it 'natural' for the authorities to put the ethical responsibility of a structural problem on the individual migrant. It becomes easier to defend the authorities' negation of support and assistance.

Undocumented migrants are as well positioned as non-existent, invisualized and by this defined as far away from their boundaries of responsibility. It is a problem if a person without legal attributes, as a national registration, a valid residence permit, contacts the authorities and in this encounter the undocumented migrant becomes and anti-citizen. This is a clear reduction of the undocumented migrant's possibilities to contact different Social Service Offices.

In addition, when a denizen looses her/his legal status and the authorities confirm their boundaries of responsibility by saying that they cannot help her/him any longer, as with Farouk' s case. If the person tries to negotiate these boundaries a positioning of the former denizen as an anti-citizen occurs. The demand for help is crossing the boundaries of responsibility that the handling officer is safeguarding.

Some of our interview persons did describe the undocumented migrant as 'illegal' and which we relates to categorization as criminals, breaking the law by physically staying within the borders of the country. We outline that this is another way of positioning an undocumented migrant as an anti-citizen and reproducing the hegemonic discourse of 'illegality'

We consider the discourse of 'illegality' to be legitimated within the authorities, in different ways. The interview persons position the situation of undocumented migrants outside themselves as professionals and put the responsibility for undocumented migrants outside their work activities, or on the individual migrant. We have shown that there exists a relation between the social workers and the undocumented migrants, even if the latter are not viewed as a target group. The social worker legitimates the position of undocumented migrants as illegal, when s/he safeguards the boundary of what is defined as an authority's responsibilities.

We have one last question to ourselves in this final stage of the working process, as to remind us of our position as students and researchers. Our aim in the beginning of this piece of work was to write something that could develop social work with undocumented migrants or even improve the situation for undocumented migrants (!) What happened with these goals? If we had a second chance, how could we do the study differently and possible to use in the field of social work with undocumented migrants and their right to social rights?

Finally, we find it a politically relevant question how the position of undocumented migrants as non-citizens is safeguarded by authorities. The categorization of undocumented migrants as 'the others' and the exclusion of access to social service is not only a political problem on a policy level but also on an implementation level, where the practice is both reproduced and justified.

6. References

Bhavnani, Kum-kum (1994) *Tracing the Contours. Feminist research and Feminist Objectivity*. I: Afshar, Haleh and Maynard, Mary (red.) *The Dynamic's of 'Race' and Gender. Some Feminist Interventions*. London: Taylor & Fancis.

Brochmann, Grete and Hammar, Tomas (red) (1999) *Mechanism of Immigration control, a comparative analysis of European regulation policies*, Oxford, Berg

Börjesson, Mats & Palmgren, Eva (2007)*Diskursens analys i praktiken--introduktion* (red) Palmgren, Eva, Malmö, Liber AB

De Genova, Nicholas (2002) *Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life*, New York, annual. Rev. Anthropology 31:419-47

de los Reyes, Paulina & Mulinari, Diana (2004) *Intersektionalitet--kritiska reflektioner över (o)jämlikhetens landskap*, Malmö, Liber AB

Davies, Karen & Esseveld, Johanna (1989) *Kvalitativ kvinnoforskning,* Stockholm, arbetslivecentrum

Foucault, Michelle (1993) *Diskursens ordning* Stockholm/ Stehag, Brutus Östlings bokförlag Symposion

Fraser, Nancy (2003) Den radikala fantasin mellan omfördelning och erkännande, Göteborg, Daidalos

Franzén, Mats (2000) *I fråga om makt. Diskurser, resurser och kontexter* (red) Goldberg, Ted (2000) Samhällsproblem, Lund, Studentlitteratur

Hall L, Budd (2001) *I wish this were a poem of practices of participatory research*, (red) Reason, Peter & Bradbury, Hilary (2001) *Action Research, participative inquiry & practice*, London, Sage Publications

Hydén, Sophie & Lundberg, Anna (2004) *Inre utlänningskontroll i polisarbete*, Malmö och Linköping, Institutionen för Tematisk Utbildning och Forskning

Jegerby, Ulla (1999) *Att bedöma en social situation. Tillämpning av vinjettmetoden*, Stockholm, socialstyrelsen, Nordstedts

Kamali, Masoud (2005) *Europeiskt dilemma: strukturell och institutionell diskriminering*, kapitel 2 i SOU 2005:41 (red) de los Reyes, Paulina & Kamali, Masoud *Bortom vi och dem- teoretiska reflektioner om makt, integration och strukturell diskriminering,* Stockholm

Khosravi, Shahram (2006) *Territorialiserad mänsklighet: irreguljära immigranter och det nakna livet*, kapitel 9 i SOU 2006:37 (red) de los Reyes, Paulina, *Om välfärdens gränser och det villkorade medborgarskapet*, Stockholm

Lister, Ruth (2003) *Citizenship, Feminist perspectives*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Lister, Ruth (1998) *Citizenship of the Margins: Citizenship, Social Work and Social Action*, European Journal of Social Work. Vol I, no I, pp 5-18.

Listerborn, Carina (2002). *Trygg stad. Diskurser om kvinnors rädsla i forskning, policyutveckling och lokal praktik.* Göteborg: Tema Stadsbyggnad, Sektionen för arkitektur. Chalmers tekniska högskola.

Lundqvist, Lennart (1998) *Demokratins väktare*, Lund, Studentlitteratur

Mohanty Talpade, Chandra (2003) *Feminism utan gränser. Avkolonialiserad teori, praktiserad solidaritet*, Stockholm, Tankekraft förlag

O'Connor: 2004:181 *Gender, citizenship and welfare state regimes* (red) Kennett, Patricia (2004) *A handbook of comparative social policy* Northampton, Edgar Elgar

Repstad, Pål (1992) *Närhet och distans, kvalitativa metoder i samhällsvetenskap*, Lund, Studentlitteratur

Tilly, Charles (1998) *Durable inequality*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California press

Thurén Torsten (1991) *Vetenskapsteori för nybörjar,* Stockholm, Liber AB
Winther Jörgensen, Marianne & Phillips Louise (1999) *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*, Lund, Studentlitteratur

Internet sources

www.helsingborg.se/visionscentrum

http://www.migrationsverket.se/pdffiler/statistik/halvar/tab3ha107.pdf

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Denizen

7. Appendix 1

Vinjett Ett: FAROUK

FAS 1.
Farouk kom ensam från Afghanistan till Sverige 2004. Han fick tillfälligt uppehållstillstånd efter att ha överklagat ett avslag om asyl till Migrations domstol sommaren 2007. Farouk som är ungefär 35 år gammal bor med två andra nyanlända flyktingar i en lägenhet i 2.a hand, men blir bostadslös om en månad. Han berättar att han vill ha ett arbete. I Afghanistan arbetade han inom jordbruk. Farouk bodde med sin fru och deras tre barn i hans föräldrahem, innan han lämnade Afghanistan. Under året som gått har Farouk blivit mer och mer nedstämd, vilket påverkar hans initiativförmåga. Farouk beskriver att han är rädd för att behöva leva gömd igen och orolig för att hans familj inte ska kunna komma till Sverige.

Känner du att du kan relatera till detta fall?

Om: När och hur kommer Farouk i kontakt med er verksamhet?

Vad tror du att du skulle kunna göra för Farouk?

Vad skulle man kunna kräva av en person i hans situation?

Hur ser du på hans behov?

Hur ser du på hans framtid?

Om du inte kan hjälpa honom, var tror du att han skulle kunna vända sig?

Vad betyder integration för dig?

Utifrån din erfarenhet av integration, vad är viktigt att kommentera i Farouks fall?

Om Farouk hade varit kvinna, hade situationen varit annorlunda då?

Vi har förstått att det finns riktlinjer för hur ni ska arbeta med personer som fått avslag efter ett TUT, hur har ni arbetat med dessa riktlinjer?

Hur tolkar ni vistelsebegreppet utifrån den här situationen, vistas Farouk i kommunen om han kommer att gömma sig?

FAS 2.
Det är höst 2008 och Farouks tillfälliga uppehållstillstånd har gått ut. Farouk har ansökt om ett nytt uppehållstillstånd, men fått avslag och blivit kallad till ett återvändarsamtal. Under en period av tre månader våren 2008 har han arbetat som restaurangbiträde i Helsingborg, men har annars varit arbetslös. Han har inte haft kontakt med sin familj i Afghanistan sedan förra sommaren och är mycket orolig för dem. Farouk återger i förtroende till er att han funderat på att ta sitt liv och beskriver utförligt hur han skulle gå tillväga.

Hur ser du på Farouks situation nu?

Vad har förändrats?

Hur ser hans behov ut nu?

Har du fortfarande kontakt med honom? I så fall hur och varför?

Vad skulle du säga till Farouk?

Vad skulle du kunna göra för Farouk? Vad tror du Farouk väljer att göra?

Om han tvingas gömma sig, vad har du för möjligheter/begränsningar att tillmötesgå hans behov?

Kommer ni i kontakt med personer som har varit gömda eller som ni misstänker kommer gömma sig? Finns det något ni kan göra för dessa personer?

Anser ni att Farouk fortfarande vistas i Helsingborgs kommun, även om han har fått avslag?

Vinjett Två: FEVEN

FAS 1.

Feven kom ensam från Somalia till Sverige 2006 när hon var 19 år. Hon ansökte om asyl i direkt anslutning till ankomsten. Under asylprocessen beviljas Feven ekonomisk daglig ersättning enligt LMA (1994:137) och deltar i några introduktionsaktiviteter. Under den första tiden bor Feven hos en bekant i Helsingborg, men på grund av en del komplikationer tvingades hon flytta. Trots att hon helst vill bo kvar i Helsingborg, flyttar hon därefter på obestämd tid in hos en bekant i Malmö. Under denna period, då Feven väntar på att få stanna i Sverige, jobbar hon svart som städerska på ett mindre städföretag som städar i privata hem i Helsingborg med omnejd. Arbetet sker under väldigt osäkra arbetsförhållanden. Ett osäkert moment är att Feven under långa perioder inte får ut sin lön. Feven hoppas och tror att hon ska få möjlighet att studera i framtiden.

Kan du relatera till det här fallet?

Hur ser ni på Fevens behov?

Anser ni att Feven vistas i Helsingborgs kommun?

Är det möjligt för henne att komma i kontakt med er verksamhet?

I så fall; vad kan ni göra för henne?

Hur ser ni på hennes boende situation?

Vad kan hon göra, vilka lagar/ regler gäller?

Om hon tvingas gömma sig; vad har ni för möjligheter/ begränsningar att tillmötesgå hennes behov?

FAS 2.
Det är nu vår 2010 och Feven fick avslag på sin asylansökan under sommaren 2008. Sedan dess har hon levt "gömd" på olika adresser i Helsingborg och Malmö, för tillfället befinner hon sig i utkanten av Helsingborg, där hon arbetar vidare på städföretaget. Feven har under sin tid i Sverige, mestadels bott i Helsingborg men har på grund av komplikationer med boende och rädsla för att bli upptäckt av polisen eller Migrationsverket inte stannat på samma adress.

Hon har fått allvarliga sömnproblem, mycket mardrömmar och känner sig mer och mer orolig och ängslig inför sin osäkra situation. Hon är väldigt rädd för att bli utvisad till Somalia.

Vad har förändrats?

Anser du att Feven vistas i Helsingborgs kommun?

Hur ser du på Fevens situation nu?

Har du träffat någon kvinna som har erfarenheter som liknar hennes?

Hur tror du hennes behov ser ut?

Var skulle Feven kunna vända sig?

Vad har du för möjligheter/ begränsningar att tillmötesgå hennes behov?

Vilka skillnader ser du på Farouks och Fevens situation?

Finns det något ni kan göra för personer som gömmer sig?

Är det möjligt att komma i kontakt med Introduktions team om man inte får en introduktionsplats via Migrationsverket?

Om inte ni kan göra någonting kan Feven uppsöka socialtjänsten?
Har de någon underrättelseskyldighet till polisen?