

”Dom kallar den här som en förvaret”: A qualitative study of the lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden



LUND UNIVERSITY

Author: Mina Ismail

Supervisor: Karin Lindsjö

Department of Human Geography

Lund University

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Bachelor of Science in Development Studies

Major in Human Geography

SGED10

May 2019

Abstract

This thesis addresses the lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden, in the light of Sweden's ongoing expansion of its detention capacity, and increasingly deportation focused migration policy. The research follows a qualitative design. Qualitative interviews with current and former detainees comprise the main source of data. The sampling method used for the study is generic purposive snowball sampling, and collected data is analyzed through a Critical Discourse Analysis. The thesis argues, in coherence with previous studies, that there is a gap between the official discourse, and the lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden. The analysis of the research illustrates how immigrant detainees' experience administrative confinement as punitive and criminalizing. The study stresses the importance of increasing critical understanding of practices of immigrant detention, calling for more critical research on the topic.

Key words: *Immigrant detention, Space, Criminalization, Stigmatization, Racialization, Power dominance, Critical Discourse*

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank you who decided to share your experiences with me, who offset time and patience to increase my understanding and knowledge of immigrant detention in Sweden. It is my hope that your stories will contribute to shedding light on your situations, to counteract silence and to increase solidarity and understanding. I would also like to thank everyone who helped me to build a contact network for the purpose of this thesis, and my supervisor for great support.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Specific aim	7
1.2 Research question.....	7
1.3 Significance of the study	8
1.4 Delimitations.....	9
1.5 Structure of the thesis	9
2. Literature review.....	10
3. Background	12
3.1 Förvaret: the Swedish immigrant detention system	12
4. Conceptual framework.....	16
4.1 Space and social inequality.....	17
4.1.1 Mobilizing and immobilizing the unwanted others	17
4.1.2 Widening the gap between the citizen and the non-citizen.....	18
4.2 Immigrant detention, power and discourse.....	18
4.2.1 Stigmatization and depersonalization	19
4.2.2 Stigmas of criminality.....	19
4.3 Immigrant detention and racialization.....	20
5. Methodology.....	21
5.1 Research design and epistemology	21
5.2 Sampling.....	21
5.2.1. Access.....	22
5.3 Data collection: Interviews and textual material.....	23
5.4 Analysis: critical discourse analysis (CDA)	24
5.4.1 Coding	25
5.5 Ethical considerations.....	25
5.6 Biases and limitations.....	26
5.6.1 Self-reflexivity	27
6. Analysis and empirical findings	27
6.1 Experiences and resistances of criminalizing stigmas.....	28
6.2 Lived experiences of the spatiality of immigrant detention.....	30
6.2.1 Perspectives on immobility through confinement	30
6.2.2 Perspectives on forced mobility	34
6.3. Perspectives on autonomy: “ <i>You know, they control my life</i> ”	36
6.3.1 Immigrant detention’s implications on health and wellbeing	37

6.4 Respondents' relations to staff and authorities	39
6.5 Being unrecognized and unrepresented.....	41
6.6 Summary of analysis	43
7. Concluding discussion	44
Bibliography.....	46
Appendix 1: List of respondents.....	49

1. Introduction

“Hi I will tell you a little bit about the detention center and how it is for those who are here. I have been in detention for almost 4 months. I do not know why they do not call this prison but I think it is worse than a prison. I have not at all been in prison and knew nothing about how it is there. I did commit no crime why am I here, is it because I’m a refugee maybe or who will answer my questions. No there is no person. The only words you hear here is ‘unfortunately’, for example ‘unfortunately you have been rejected’, ‘unfortunately, unfortunately they will deport you’, ‘and unfortunately there is no alternative that you can stay’ and things like that. I was sick but was not allowed to see a doctor and no medicine. I was going to kill myself because I thought that the staff that work there they are like robots and have no feelings and understand nothing. Why am I going to be here? I just want an answer, nothing more please answer me.” (Ali 2019.04.22).¹

International migration is a contested field in the development discourse (de Haas 2010). Deportations and administrative confinement of (im)migrants are increasingly used as state measures to control, and regulate global mobility, access to citizenship, and to reassess state sovereignty (Baker 2012). Meanwhile Sweden traditionally has been acknowledged for its ‘soft’ policies on migration, recent research indicate increased criminalization of irregular stay and deportation processes (Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015:161, Canning 2019). Effective return of migrants has become a state priority in Sweden, and immigrant detention is increasingly used as a measure to facilitate returns and investigations of migrants’ identities (Migrationsverket 2019, Canning 2019). Although Sweden currently is undergoing an expansion of its capacity to administratively detain non-citizen migrants, immigrant detention remains an invisible part of Swedish migration policy (Andersson et al. 2016:9), and immigrant detainees are structurally kept hidden from public view (Mountz et al. 2012, Canning 2019). Recent qualitative research indicates a growing gap between the official discourse on immigrant detention and the lived experiences of the practice (Silverman and Massa 2012, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014). Ali (2019.04.22) is one of approximately 3800 individuals who annually are held in Swedish immigrant detention centers on administrative basis (statistic from 2018) (Migrationsverket 2019). Unique for detention of immigrants is that the detainees are not confined based on criminal charges, but on administrative grounds (Khosravi 2009). At the time Ali (2019.04.22) (*see quote above*) replied to my question of how he experienced being detained, he had been held confined in Sweden for the last four months, awaiting the most likely outcome of a deportation. Though every lived experience

¹ Note: Ali is a fictive name. All respondents in the study are given fictive names to protect their integrity and anonymity. The quote is translated from Swedish by the author.

of immigrant detention is unique, the empirical findings of this research adheres with previous studies, indicating that immigrant detention is experienced as imprisonment by detainees themselves (Khosravi 2009, Klein and Williams 2012, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015:5, Andersson et al. 2016).

Administrative confinement of immigrants is geographic in its nature, and builds on several spatial rationales. Namely to regulate and control the mobility of unwanted populations (Mountz et al. 2012). Immigrant detention manifests a complex nexus between voluntary mobility, immobility, and forced, or regulated, mobility. Thus making visible how *space* is used as mean of control. Furthermore, confinement of immigrants plays a role in the discursive reproduction of racialized and unequal social systems (Pred 2000:98, Mountz et al. 2012, Keating 2015, van Dijk 1993, 2015). Recognizing that the voices of migrant detainees to a large extent are absent in public discourse, this research aspires to lift some of the voiced that are structurally kept silenced (Canning 2019). Applying a Critical Discourse Analysis it is aspired to increase the public awareness of *lived experiences* of immigrant detention. In solidarity with Ali (2019.04.22), and many others, is argued that that there is a growing gap between political discourse and the lived experiences of administrative confinement, and therefore a pressing need to make visible lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden.

1.1 Specific aim

The aim of this research is to give voice to the lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden, from the perspective of the detainees. Thereby to increase the public awareness and understanding of administrative confinement. Through a Critical Discourse Analysis the research aspires to challenge the ongoing expansion and normalization of (im)migrant confinement (van Dijk 1993, 2015). Recognizing the absence of migrants' discourse on detention in official records, this research argues for the importance of giving voice to detainees in framing their own realities. The research adheres with previous critical scholarly work (van Dijk 1993, 2015, Koshravi 2009, Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019), drawing on the role of discourse in maintaining social inequalities and cultural systems.

1.2 Research question

The research is guided by the following question:

- *What are immigrant detainees' lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden, in the light of Sweden's ongoing expansion of its detention capacity?*

The research question embeds an open formulation, so that scope is given to lift the grass-root perspectives on Swedish immigrant detention. Nonetheless, the issue is addressed in relation to its wider political and geographical context.

1.3 Significance of the study

This section outlines the significance of the study. It is highlighted that in response to Sweden's increasingly deportation-focused migration policy, and planned and undergoing expansion of immigrant detention capacity, there is a pressing need to incorporate migrants' perspectives on detention. Thus, striving towards closing the gap between policy and practice. During 2018 and 2019 the Swedish Migration Agency underwent an expansion of its capacity to detain non-citizens, as a part of the Swedish government's priority of 'effective returns' (Migrationsverket 2019). During 2018 Sweden's immigrant detention capacity was expanded from 357 places in the beginning of the year, to 417 places in the end of the year (Migrationsverket 2019:85). Furthermore, while the staffing in Swedish migrant reception centers *decreased* between 2017 and 2018, the staffing in Swedish detention facilities *increased* with 68 percent during 2018. Financial resources have gradually been directed towards expansion of detention and deportation measures, with the opening of new detention facilities and increased collaboration between the state, migration authorities and the police (Migrationsverket 2019). In sum, Sweden's increasingly restrictive rhetoric on immigration has contributed to a harsher policy environment for asylum seekers and irregular migrants (FARR 2017, Global Detention Project 2018).

Recognizing ongoing expansion of Swedish detention infrastructure and capacity, associated to the increasingly restrictive discourse on migration deployed by responsible authorities, this research draws on the significance of lifting the lived experiences of immigrant detention. Whereas the Swedish Migration Agency (Migrationsverket.se 2019) frame detention as virtually administrative and as a 'last resort' to facilitate returns, research indicate that detainees themselves experiences detention as unjust imprisonment (Khosravi 2009, Debono, Rönqvist and Magnusson 2015, Puthoopparambil, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015, Andersson et al. 2016). As detention and deportation processes continue to expand globally, this research argues that immigrant detention is a pressing political and geographical issue (Mountz et al. 2012). Though immigrant detention in many contexts remains an invisible part of migration control practices, this research calls for the need of making visible the experiences of such processes (Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016:9). In accordance with Canning (2019) this research draws on the significance of studying Sweden as an example. Sweden is internationally is acknowledged for its 'soft' policies and high material standard in its immigrant detention facilities. However, an image which discursively operates to legitimize the existence of administrative confinement of (im)migrants in the first place, whereby further undermining the lived experiences of detainees (Canning 2019). This aspect draws attention to the relevance of taking an abolitionist

standpoint when discussing immigrant detention, thus lifting the focus from merely material conditions in the detention facilities, to discursively challenge the existence of non-citizen confinement.

To sum up, in a context where incarceration of (im)migrants is expanding, and is becoming gradually normalized, this research stresses the significance of giving voice to the lived experiences and to add to the growing body of critical research on immigrant detention in Sweden and globally. The research draws on the significance of giving access to discourse to social groups that are structurally silenced, to frame their own realities. The significance of analyzing discourse in making visible, understanding, and ultimately challenging unequal social structures is furthermore stressed (van Dijk 1993, 2015, Canning 2019).

1.4 Delimitations

Notwithstanding that confinement and mobility restrictions are imposed on (im)migrants globally, this study is limited to focus on the experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden. Though it is recognized that detention processes are inseparable from the wider deportation system, the research is limited in emphasizing in particular the aspect of detention. The study is limited in its focus, as it solely addresses detention of adults. Furthermore, this research primarily emphasizes the role of space and discourse in (re)producing unequal social systems (Pred 2000:185, Keating 2015). Important to note, is that the research is directed to immigrant detention. Thus confinement based on administrative grounds and not due to criminal charges. For more specific limitations related to the sample see section 5.5 *Biases and limitations*.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

By outlining the different parts of the study, this section presents a brief overview of the structure of the thesis. After introducing the topic, the focus and the aim of the research, the study situates itself within existing body of scholarly work. This is presented in section 2. *Literature Review*. The literature review illustrates where this study seeks to add to existing knowledge, and where it aspires to fill identified knowledge gaps. In section 3. the *Background* is presented. The background provides a thick description of the geographical, political and historical context of immigrant detention in Sweden. The *Conceptual Framework* is outlined in section 4., and presents the theoretical lens from which the study is conducted. The study draws on; Critical Human Geography, theories of criminalization of migration, theories of stigma as a form of power, theories of racialization. In section 5. *Methodology*, data collection, sampling, and analysis procedures are delineated, as well as ethical considerations, biases and limitations in relation to the research. The empirical findings and analysis are presented under section 6. *Analysis and empirical findings*. Finally, the research question is answered and discussed in relation to the empirical material in section 7. *Concluding discussion*.

2. Literature review

The following paragraphs situate the study within the body of existing literature on the topic. Despite administrative confinement being to a large extent unspoken about in official records, the Global Detention Project (2019) and the Asylum Information Data Base (FARR 2017) provide insightful information on the Swedish and global immigrant detention system. Furthermore, a handful qualitative studies on immigrant detention in Sweden have been conducted. The empirical findings of previous studies emphasize detainees' experiences of detention as imprisonment (Khosravi 2009, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Puthooppambal, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019). Studies on the lived experiences of immigrant detention in the UK and Belgium draw similar conclusions (Klein and Williams 2012, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014, Bosworth 2018).

Several sources indicate Sweden's shift in public discourse on migration, stressing a hardening policy environment for asylum seekers and irregular migrants (FARR 2017, Global Detention Project 2019). Previous literature addressing immigrant detention has primarily been conducted from a reformist standpoint, assessing areas of improvement in detention facilities to ensure detainees wellbeing. However, yet a few studies pose a more critical standpoint towards immigrant detention, challenging the very existence of non-citizen confinement as an institution (Khosravi 2009, Canning 2019). In her research, assessing the implications of the use of 'soft policies' in Swedish immigrant detention facilities, Canning (2019) stresses that the very practice of detention implicitly and unavoidably inflicts harm. Canning (2019) argues that the practice of 'kindness' and 'architectural softness' in Swedish immigrant detention facilities do not eradicate, but rather mask, the unavoidable presence of *violence* that is embedded in immigrant detention as an institution. Canning (2019:6) concludes that: "*coercive violence is present in Swedish immigrant detention because, unlike prisons, the end purpose of confinement is the physical removal of the unwanted migrant Other*". Canning (2019) emphasis that meanwhile Sweden has a comparatively low detention capacity, the Swedish immigrant detention apparatus is increasingly directed towards deportations. This leaves Sweden as one of the leading countries in deportation per capita (Canning 2019). Several studies have directed critique towards inadequate access to healthcare in Swedish detention facilities, and the detrimental effects of detention on the wellbeing of the detainees have been well reported. Resignation syndrome, depression, sleeping distortion, stress and suicides and suicide attempts have previously been reported in Swedish immigrant detention facilities (Khosravi 2009, Puthooppambal, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019).

With the purpose of counteracting the silence and criminal stigmas associated to immigrant detention in Sweden, Andersson et al. (2016) provide a deep insight in the lived experiences

of detention. Through an anthology based on testimonies collected from current and former detainees in Åstorp detention center in Sweden, as well as narratives from civil society actors, Andersson et al. (2016) aspire to raise awareness of, and create a better understanding for, the personal narratives of detainees. The core of the anthology is critical, thus expressing resistance towards the very practice of non-citizen confinement (Andersson et al. 2016). Resonating with existing academic work, Andersson et al. (2016) stress the criminalizing effects of immigrant detention. The authors underline how administrative incarceration is punitive in its nature and experienced as imprisonment by detainees, furthermore (re)enforces the image of immigrant detainees as criminals to the wider public (Khosravi 2009, Silverman and Massa 2012, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Puthooppambil, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015, Andersson et al. 2016:16-18). The lived experiences of immigrant detention as imprisonment is a present theme in corresponding reviewed literature. Criminalization of (im)migrants has received substantial scholarly attention (Barker 2012, Šalamon 2017, Leyro and Stageman 2018, Menjívar, Gómez Cervantes and Alvord 2018). It is well acknowledged how states deploy criminal sanctions to control and regulate undesired mobility, and how such practices have vast implications for the lived experiences of migrants (Khosravi 2009, Barker 2012, Andersson et al. 2016, Leyro and Stageman 2018). Khosravi (2009) assesses the implication of criminalization of migration in the Swedish detention and deportation system. Through ethnographic field work Khosravi (2009) underlines migrants' experiences of detention as a punishment and how immigrant detention is experienced as prison-like by detainees. Several studies confirm the dialectic relationship between criminalizing (im)migrants, and justifying their confinement and removal (Khosravi 2009, Baker 2012, Mountz et al. 2012).

A comprehensive study of the lived experiences of migrants in detention in Belgium illustrates a growing gap between migrants' discourse on detention, and contemporary policy environment and political discourse (Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014). Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn (2014:568) draw attention to the shift in public discourse on immigrant detention, from being an "*exceptional measure*", towards being "*normal*" and an "*essential state instrument of immigration control*". The study underlines detainees' bewilderment over their confinement, and their resistance to criminal stigmas. Furthermore the study addresses the hardships and implications related to not having a formal citizenship, grounded in how participants in the study made identity-based claims of belonging outside the realm of formal citizenship. Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn (2014) point to the difficulty to access detained populations, resulting in that migrants discourse on detention systematically are left out from academic research. In accordance to the findings of Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn (2014) a qualitative study conducted in UK based on interviews with migrants post-release from IRC's (immigrant removal centers) underlines migrants' experiences of administrative detention as purely punitive (Klein and Williams 2012). Several studies indicate how immigrant detention is a racialized process (Mountz et al. 2012, Silverman and Massa 2012, Bosworth 2018, Canning 2019), playing a role

in reconfiguration of ethnical and racial relations as it operates on the premises to regulate and manage the mobility of populations which comes predominantly from the global south (Bosworth 2018:225). Nevertheless, the aspect of institutionalized racialized processes embedded in immigrant detention are absent from contemporary debate.

To sum up, a review of existing research on immigrant detention indicate that there is a prevailing gap between the official discourse on detention and migrant detainees perspectives. Coherent through all reviewed qualitative studies on immigrant detention is detainees' experiences of administrative confinement as punitive and imprisonment. Although qualitative studies on the lived experiences of immigrant detention have been conducted, the need to continue to add to the growing body of critical research on immigrant detention remains. Though migrants' perspectives on detention hitherto are absent, or underrepresented in policy and public discourse.

3. Background

This section situates the study within its political and geographical context, seeking to shed light on contemporary immigrant detention infrastructure in Sweden.

As previously outlined Sweden has traditionally been acknowledged for its humane treatment of migrants and asylum seekers (Khosravi 2009, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015). However, since an increased number of asylum applications in 2015, Sweden has underwent a shift in public discourse, characterized by increased securitization and criminalization of, in particular irregular (im)migration (Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015:161, Global Detention Project 2018, Global Detention Project 2019). Since the beginning of the 2000's Sweden's immigrant detention system has expanded continuously, with increased focus on deportations. Although Sweden's immigrant detention capacity remains comparatively low in relation to other countries', Sweden currently has one of the highest averages of deportations per capita in the world (Canning 2019). Despite the fact that immigrant detention plays a central role in facilitating deportations and removal of non-citizens, it remains an invisible part of Swedish Migration Policy, receiving low public awareness, attention and critique (Andersson et al. 2016).

3.1 Förvaret: the Swedish immigrant detention system

It is important to delineate the difference between immigrant detention from detention for criminal suspects. Thus, immigrant detention is not issued based on criminal charges, but used as an administrative measure to keep detainees available for the authorities (Khosravi 2009). Immigrant detention is used primarily to facilitate returns and deportations of migrants, through preventing

detainees from absconding. The annual report published by the Swedish Migration Agency (Migrationsverket 2019:85) underlines how immigrant detention constitutes a part of an 'effective and sustainable asylum system'. Detention of non-citizens is also used during investigations of the person's right to remain in Sweden, and/ or during investigations of a person's identity (The Global Detention Project 2018, Migrationsverket 2019). The Swedish term for immigrant detention is "*förvar*", a concept that literally translated signifies a storage or warehouse (Khosravi 2009). In Sweden, detention orders for non-citizens can be issued by either the Migration Agency, the Police or the Migration Court. It is currently the Swedish Migration Agency that are responsible for existing detention facilities in Sweden (Global Detention Project 2018, Migrationsverket 2019).

The Swedish Migration Agency outline previous and ongoing expansion of Sweden's immigrant detention and deportation capacities (Migrationsverket 2019). Statistic from the Swedish Migration Agency (Migrationsverket 2019) (*see below*, table.1), displays the average length of stay, number of visits, as well as distribution between male and female, adult and children detainees in Sweden. The table shows that a predominant part of non-citizens that are held in detention are adult men (3445 male detainees in 2018, in relation to 358 female detainees the same year) (table.1). The table indicates that despite that the average number of annual detentions decrease from 4249 in 2017, to 3816 during 2018, the length of stay in detention increased from 22,3 days to 29,2 days during the same period (table.1) (Migrationsverket 2019:86). The report shows that on average in Sweden, male detainees are more likely to spend longer time periods in detention than females (in 2018 the average stay for male detainees was 30 days, for females 19 days) (table.1) (Migrationsverket 2019:86).

Table 1. Persons detained in Sweden 2016-2018

		2016		2017		2018	
		Number of stays	Average length of stay (days)	Number of stays	Average length of stay (days)	Number of stays	Average length of stay (days)
Children	Girls	41	2.7	24	1.4	7	10.1
	Boys	50	4.6	29	4.2	6	3.2
	Total	91	3.7	53	2.9	13	6.9
Adults	Women	393	12.2	469	12.5	358	19.0
	Men	3092	21.6	3727	23.3	3445	30.0
	Total	3485	20.7	4196	22.3	3803	29.2
Totalt		3576	20.4	4249	22.1	3816	29.1

**An individual may have several different stays in detention.*

The number of individuals with singular stays in detention:

2016= 3452 singular individuals

2017= 4101 singular individuals

2018= 3707 singular individuals

Source : (Migrationsverket 2019:86)

The length of a detention depends on which grounds the individuals are held detained. In general the time spent in immigrant detention ranges between 48 hours and three months (Global Detention Project 2018). Although longer periods of detention occurs. The Global Detention Project (2018) indicates how the length of average stay has increased continuously since 2015, when the average stay in detention was 18 days. In Sweden, the official maximum length for adult detention is 12 months (Puthooppambal, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015).

Sweden has currently five operating immigrant detention facilities (förvar), located in different locations; Flen, Källered (Gothenburg), Märsta, Gävle and Åstorp (Global Detention Project 2018). During 2018 and 2019 Sweden started an ongoing expansion of its detention infrastructure, as a part of an increasingly returned focus migration policy (Canning 2019). The total capacity was expanded from 357 places in detention in the beginning of 2018 to 417 places in the end of the year (Global Detention Project 2018). During 2019 the capacity is planned increase to 457 places, with opening of new immigrant detention facilities (FARR 2017:65, Global Detention Project 2018, Migrationsverket 2019:85).

The legal framework for immigrant detention in Sweden is governed by the Aliens Act (2005:716 Ch.10). The legal grounds for detention applies both for asylum seekers and for

undocumented non-citizens (Aliens Act 2005:716 Ch.10). The percentage of regular asylum seekers in detention is however comparatively low according to the Global Detention Project (2018). The Aliens Act (2005:716) does not only set the grounds for detention of non-citizens, but regulate Sweden's migration policy at large, and outlines who is and who is not entitled a resident permit. Already in 1914 Sweden incorporated detention and deportation of non-citizen migrants in its national law. Grounded in the Aliens Act amended in 1927, the grounds justifying immigrant detention were expanded during the 1940s and 50s, stating that an individual could be detained if his, or her, identity could not be established. In 1976 the grounds justifying detention were once again restricted, resulting in a decrease in immigrant detention at the time (Global Detention Project 2018). The most recent amendment of the Aliens Act (2005:716) once again expanded the grounds for justification of immigrant detention, further contributing in justifying the practice (Global Detention Project 2018).

Characteristic for the immigrant detention centers are that they are spatially enclosed facilities, which the detainees are not permitted to leave (Canning 2019, Migrationsverket.se 2019). In Sweden, as elsewhere, immigrant detention centers are often located outside urban centers, rendering access more difficult (Mountz et al. 2012). Although the Migration Agency frames detention of immigrants as virtuously administrative, research indicates how detainees experience Swedish immigrant detention as punitive, or as imprisonment (Khosravi 2009, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015:163). Nevertheless, Sweden has received international attention for its humane migration policies, and high physical standards in detention facilities (Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Canning 2019). In contrast to many other European countries, Sweden has shown an increase use of soft policies and architectural softness related to immigrant detention, focusing on for instance detainees' access to recreational activities within the centers (Canning 2019). However, Canning (2019) argues that Sweden's adaptation of 'soft policies' undermine the critique towards immigrant detention, as it legitimizes the existence of the practice to the wider public. Canning (2019) states that the Swedish strategy of 'architectural softness' operates to keep detainees structurally silent while legitimizing the existence, and ongoing expansion of detention and deportations. Through being in accordance with legislative and administrative law, immigrant detention in Sweden as in many other countries, is characterized by a normalized and de-politicized discourse, rendering detention and detainees to a large extent invisible (Nash 2003, Price 2009, Andersson et al. 2016:9).

As noted previously, Sweden's migration policy is increasingly deportation focused. However, the conduct of, in particularly forced deportations, has gained growing civil society resistance in Sweden (Canning 2019). Of all the forced and voluntary returns from Sweden in 2018, deportations to Afghanistan and Iraq constituted the largest part (table. 2). Statistics indicate how men are overrepresented in the number of total annual returns from Sweden. According to the Migration Agency (Migrationsverket 2019) this is due to the larger part of male asylum applicants.

Table 2. Citizenships of persons faced removal orders, 2016-2018

Citizenship	2016			2017			2018		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
Afghanistan	1001	2729	3730	556	3938	4494	855	7149	8004
Iraq	1342	3540	4882	752	2395	3147	836	2340	3176
Georgia	206	499	705	281	633	914	243	733	976
Iran	329	813	1142	180	361	541	254	480	734
Albania	517	1027	1544	268	620	888	221	435	656
Other	5468	10041	15509	4814	8716	13530	3612	6732	10344
Total	8863	18649	27512	6851	16663	23514	6021	17869	23890

Source: (Migrationsverket 2019:88)

To sum up, this section has outlined the contextual background of the study. Relying on recent data published by the Migration Agency (Migrationsverket 2019) it has been demonstrated how Sweden is undergoing an expansion of its current immigrant detention capacity. It has further been shown that immigrant detention in Sweden is closely interlinked to the country's increasingly deportation focused migration policy. Additionally, it has been carefully noted that immigrant detention is an administrative practices, and detainees are not held on criminal charges, but to facilitate removal through ensuring availability of the non-citizen (Khosravi 2009)

4. Conceptual framework

The upcoming paragraphs discuss the theoretical foundation of the research. Primarily, this thesis draws on the conceptual understanding of immigrant detention as an inherently spatial process (Mountz et al. 2012). Space plays a vital role in visualizing social inequalities (Pred 2000, Keating 2015). Criminalization, stigmatization and racialization are closely tied to (and reinforced by) processes of spatial exclusion (Pred 2000:111, Mountz et al. 2012, Wacquant, Slater and Pereira 2014, Keating 2015). Combining a critical human geography framework with theories of stigma power, this conceptual framework conceptualizes immigrant detention as a spatial process, operating to separate *unwanted* non-citizens from *true* (idealized) citizens (Baker 2012, Mountz et al. 2012). The framework takes an interdisciplinary and structural approach, addressing the nexus between space, discourse, stigmas of criminality, processes of racialization, and their role in (re)producing and legitimizing social inequalities through making invisible the 'unwanted' (migrant) (van Dijk 1993, 2015, Pred 2000:63,111,149, Mountz et al. 2012, Wacquant, Slater and Pereira 2014).

4.1 Space and social inequality

Space plays a vital role in understanding the practice of immigrant detention (Mountz et al. 2012). Keating (2015) stresses how an analysis of space can provide an enriching tool when analyzing cultural systems, thus social inequalities and power relations often are manifested in, as well as naturalized through space. Space governs for instance who has access to resources, as well as shapes the discourse around the population associated to a certain spatial locale (Pred 2000:98, Wacquant, Slater and Pereira 2014, Keating 2015). Immigrant detention can be understood as a physical, as well as symbolic space, manifesting how symbolic power of dominance is experienced and exercised through spatial relations (Silverman and Massa 2012).

Mountz et al. (2012) applies Critical Human Geography when conceptualizing immigrant detention. Stressing that while detention based on the lack of formal citizenship is a political issue, the practice builds on several, none the less, paradoxical spatial rationales. Therefore, immigrant detention also comprises a pressing geographical issue, which however to a large extent has been overlooked in the field of human geography (Mountz et al. 2012, Silverman and Massa 2012). This research draws on Mountz et al.'s (2012) conceptualization of detention's role in *mobilizing* and *immobilizing* migrants, as well as detention's role in bordering the gap between non-citizens and citizens, both conceptually and physically through space.

4.1.1 Mobilizing and immobilizing the unwanted others

Immigrant detention can be understood in the light of mobilizing as well as immobilizing unwanted non-citizens. Meanwhile detention builds on the logic of *confining*, thus the individual detainee is deprived of his or her mobility, immigrant detention simultaneously operates to make mobile the collective identity of the detainees (Mountz et al. 2012). In other words, through confinement, the individual body of the migrant is transformed into something deportable. Immigrant detention can therefore be understood as a strategy of stripping detainees of their individual identity, to replace it with the collective identity of 'deportability' (Mountz et al. 2012). Therefore, rather than ending mobility altogether, immigrant detention is underpinned by the rationales of *controlling* and *regulating* mobility. Henceforth, manifesting what is desirable mobility and what is not, as well as who is entitled to move freely, and who is not. Mountz et al. (2012) stress how detention frequently moves migrants around, both between different facilities and through deportations. Through confinement, the *unregulated* mobility of migrants' is converted into to regulate, forced mobility. There is a dialectic relationship between 'moving migrants around' and (re)enforcing the image of migrants as a fluid deportable entity. Mountz et al. (2012:528) illustrate the paradoxical relationship between mobility and confinement that immigrant detention comprises, stating how: "*Detention, in its fixed moments, immobilizes migrants only to move them elsewhere, and moves migrants only to ensure their future immobility [deportation]*".

4.1.2 Widening the gap between the citizen and the non-citizen

Through confinement, detainees are rendered invisible from the view of the public (Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019). The architecture of detention centers, their spatial location (often located in rural areas, or outside urban centers) implicitly operate to prevent any interaction between detainees and the outside world (Mountz et al. 2012, Canning 2019). Immigrant detention henceforth manifests spatial isolation and exclusion of detainees (Class, Shove and Urry 2005, Mountz et al. 2012, Silverman and Massa 2012), thus reinforces stigmatizing and racial images of (im)migrants as criminals and underserving (Pred 2000:98, Khosravi 2009, Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016). Detention ultimately manifest a two way relationship; on the one hand it legitimizes removal (deportation) of the detainee, on the other it reinforces the image of the ‘true’ citizen (Barker 2012). Pred (2000:111) argues how excluding the perceived “others” confirms the identity of the dominant: “*Then and now, the dialectical fusing of space and identity. Then and now, the space of the Other as a negation of the space of the dominant, and thereby a confirmation of the identity of the dominant*”. Accordingly, Barker (2012) conceptualizes immigrant detention as a part of a wider strategy of reassessing state sovereignty. On a conceptual level, immigrant detention (re)produces and (re)inforce borders between the citizen and the non-citizen, as well as between the *deserving* migrant and the *undeserving* (deportable) migrant. The process of detention manifest the *physical removal* of the *unwanted* from normative space (Price 2009, Mahtani 2014).

4.2 Immigrant detention, power and discourse

Up to here the conceptual understanding of immigrant detention has been framed predominantly in relation to theories of Critical Human Geography. It is however recognized that detention per se is a highly political issue. Van Dijk’s (1993) understanding of *power dominance* is argued to be both manifested and naturalized in the spatiality of immigrant detention.

Power and dominance of one group over the other is often manifested in space (Pred 2000:111, Silverman and Massa 2012, Wacquant, Slater and Pereira 2014, Keating 2015). Though unequal power relations repeatedly are legitimized through being in accordance with the legal framework (van Dijk 1993), this research adopts a critical lens to the naturalization of institutionalized practices. The research draws on van Dijk’s (1993:254) understanding of social power and dominance. Stressing how social power needs to be understood in the light of “*access to socially valued resources*” and privileges, such as for example access to group membership. Furthermore, social power embeds aspects of *control* of one group over another. Such control is often discursively legitimized by the dominating group through naturalizing status quo unequal relations, and through discursively ascribing negative attributes to the (dominated) others (van Dijk 1993, Tyler and Slater 2018). Characteristic for

unequal power relations is that dominated groups (in the context of this research migrant detainees), systematically are excluded from conceptualizing their own realities, and deprived of the ability of effectively accessing discourse (van Dijk 1993).

4.2.1 Stigmatization and depersonalization

Deeply tied to the aspect of social inequality in relation to detention is the role of stigmatizing labels attached to (im)migrants and immigrant detainees. The concept stigma derives from Latin and denotes the process of branding or attributing a negative characteristic to place or a person (Schuster and Majjidi 2015, Bresnahan and Zhuang 2016). Stigmatization of a group is often deployed as a strategy to legitimize power dominance over stigmatized groups, and henceforth plays a role in naturalizing unequal social relations. This research relies on Tyler and Slater (2018) conceptualization of stigma as *power*. Stigmatization is accordingly understood, not as a neutral or natural process, but as an “*injurious form of action through collective representation fastened on people and on places*” (Tyler and Slater 2018:740). Such observation underlines the importance of lifting the debate of stigmatization to a structural level, posing the question of *where and by who is the stigma produced, and for which purpose?* (Tyler and Slater 2018:721). Thus, stigmatization may operate as a strategy to “*keep people down, in and/away*” (Tyler and Slater 2018:732). Through processes of stigmatization, the individual is deprived of his or her personal characteristics, rendering the individual invisible from public view (Pred 2000:153). Pred (2000:63) describes this as being “*Deprived of the personal. Violently homogenized. Denied any capacity for distinctive thought or agency. Converted to the invisible. Actually present, but erased from view*”.

4.2.2 Stigmas of criminality

Detention of immigrants, as well as deportation processes are strongly linked to increased criminalization of (im)migrants, in particular irregular migrants (Khosravi 2009, Baker 2012). By the discursive construction of immigrants as a ‘threat’, towards the social order, the welfare state, or towards the ‘rightful citizens’, confinement and deportations are rendered justified (Barker 2012, Mountz et al. 2012, Šalamon 2017). Mountz et al. (2012) stress the dialectic relationship between criminalization of migrants and the justification of their confinement manifested in immigrant detention. Arguing that, meanwhile detention of non-citizens is justified through the discursive construction of migrants as criminals, confinement itself reproduces the (false) image of detainees as criminals (and henceforth deportable subjects). Simply, stigmatizing images of criminality are *reproduced* through detention itself. There is a strong relation between the labels attributed to a place, and the labels fastened on the people associated to that place (Pred 2000:127, Wacquant, Slater and Pereira 2014). Thus, “*Where you are becomes who you are*” (Pred, 2000:125). The architectural attributes of detention facilities, high security

with guards, cameras, fences and walls can therefore be understood as a tool to reinforce the wider public's image of detainees as criminal subjects (Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016:16-18).

4.3 Immigrant detention and racialization

The issue of *race* has vastly been left out in the field of Critical Human geography, and in the general debate on immigrant in Sweden (Pred 2000:185, Nash 2003, Price 2009). Nevertheless, spatial processes are often racialized processes (Pred 2000:185, Nash 2003, Price 2009). This draws on the intersection between critical human geography and critical race theory, though spatial organization always has been used as a tool of stratification for racialized social control (Price 2009). Mountz et al. (2012) recognize how immigrant detention is a racialized process, and Pred (2000:98) stresses the mutually reinforcing relationship between space and racialization: "*race and space are repeatedly mixed up*", and "*the social construction of race becomes one with the physical occupation of space. The racialized become the segregated, and racial meanings become inscribed upon space*". Although administrative detention of non-citizens is based on nationality, nationality in this context becomes *racialized* (Bosworth 2018). The very existence of non-citizen confinement can be understood as racialized process, though it manifest confinement of (unwanted) populations, predominantly from the global south, on national soil in the global north (Bosworth 2018). Bosworth (2018:225) stresses that despite immigrant detention as an institution not being explicitly racist, the existence of such spaces nevertheless seems to operate to maintain status quo of racialized relations: "*Immigration policies, like all official rules, are 'race neutral', even as they always seem to position the same people in the same place in the same hierarchy*".

This research builds on Price's (2009:166) definition of racialization: "*To be racialized is to have one's physical, economic, social, and political mobility curtailed and policed. To be racialized is to be denied entry into the mainstream of power and privilege*". Racialization is hence understood in relation to self-ownership and self-determination (Nash 2003, Price 2009). A key indicator for racialization is normalization of hierarchical social relations and justification of social and political exclusion (Wodak and Reisigl 2015). Just like punitive measures against migrant populations reinforce the picture of (im)migrants as a threat towards security and order, confinement reinforces the image of foreign nationals as a *racial threat* (Barker 2012).

This conceptual framework has demonstrated how theoretical stances of; critical human geography, critical discourse, and stigmatization in form of criminalization and racialization, in complement with each other can facilitate a conceptual understanding of immigrant detention. A red thread throughout the conceptual framework has been the juxtaposition between these theoretical stances. Thus, immigrant detention is conceptualized as the physical manifestation of when unwanted social groups literally are removed from normative space (Price 2009, Mahtani 2014). In sum, immigrant detention both builds on, and reproduces, stigmatized and racialized images of (im)migrants.

Stigmatized perceptions are reinforced and manifested in the spatiality of immigrant detention, where detainees are deprived of their individual stories and homogenized, thus transformed into detainable and deportable subjects (Pred 2000:149, Mountz et al. 2012).

5. Methodology

In the upcoming sections the methodology of the research is outlined. The study follows a qualitative research design, in which qualitative interviews, complemented by primary sources of textual material comprises the main source of data. Collected data is analyzed through *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) (van Dijk 1993, 2015). The methodology includes; *Research design and epistemology, Sampling, Data collection, Analysis method, Ethical considerations, Biases and limitations.*

5.1 Research design and epistemology

The research follows a qualitative case study research design (Bryman 2012:66-70). The case is geographically limited to include experiences of immigrant detention *in Sweden*. The study aligns with the epistemological standpoint that a problem best is understood and defined by those experiencing it (van Dijk 1993:253, Bryman 2012:30, 33-35). Consequently, the research acknowledges the benefits of assessing lived experiences. A time frame is set up for the research. Thus, data is sampled only from individuals who have experienced immigrant detention within the period 2018-2019. The forthcoming section provides a deeper insight in the research's sampling methodology.

5.2 Sampling

Participants for this study have been sampled through a generic snowball-sampling approach, implying that the sampling process has been guided by the research question, and that sampling has been carried out based on the social network of key-informants and respondents (Bryman 2012:416). Snowball-sampling is a commonly used sampling method in social research that aspires to reach populations that may not be represented in academic research or official records (Klein and Williams 2012). During the data collection process of this research snowball-sampling however proved challenging, and most respondents were unable to provide any further recommendations of contacts based on their own social networks. This aspect will be further discussed in forthcoming section: *5.2.1. Access*. The initial contacts with respondents were established through the networks of local NGO's, local and national support groups for asylum seekers, refugees and detainees, and through the networks of individuals engaged in asylum right issues. Though the difficulty to build the sample around the respondents' social networks constrained the pace of the data collection process, it nevertheless mitigated the risk of relying on one

single social network when conducting snowball sampling. In contrast, all interviews were sampled from different social networks. Following a generic purposive snowball sampling approach, the respondents of the study were sample based on three generic criteria; first, respondents ought to have had lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden. Accordingly, the sample came to include; 1.) individuals that at the time of the research were held detained, 2.) individuals that previously had been detained but at the time of the research had been released and were residing in Sweden, 3.) individuals that previously had been detained but at the time of the research had been deported. The reason for the research not to solely focus on the experiences of detention for one of these groups was primarily due to the difficulty to access respondents. Modestly it was recognized challenging to collect a sufficient amount of data exclusively from currently detained individuals. As a second criteria, a time-frame was outlined, thus respondents had to have experienced immigrant detention at some stage within the period 2018-2019. The time-frame of the study was set out to mitigate the time-gap between the interview and the actual experience of detention, and henceforth increasing the accuracy of the responses. The third criteria set out for the sample was that respondents ought to be over 18 years old. This due to the focus of the research on adult detention, and due to the ethical implications of interviewing children. Due to the limited scale and scope of this research, the sample came to include six respondents. Recognizing how contextual factors shape the lived experiences of immigrant detention (Schuster and Majidi 2015), in combination with the aspiration of not stripping the data from its context, a list over the respondents is presented in Appendix 1. It should be noted that each respondent has been given a fictive name.

5.2.1. Access

The difficulty to access current and former detainees placed a major constraint on the data collection process. Detention centers are spatially enclosed facilities (Mountz et al. 2012) and due to secrecy and security standard set out by the Migration Agency, no permission to enter the center as a researcher was granted during the research². Access was also restricted with regard to that most people held in Swedish detention facilities are deported (Canning 2019). The, uncertainty about the future, being confined, and the fear of the most likely outcome of deportation have major health implications for individuals that are held detained (Khosravi 2009, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019). It was for this reason difficult to access currently held individuals who were able and willing to participate in an interview.

The limitations of snowball sampling in the light of the socio-spatial nature of immigrant detention were felt during the research. Detainees are frequently moved around, deported, or released (Mountz et al. 2012), which inhibits their ability to form stronger social ties with other detainees. For that reason it became difficult for the research to sample based on the social networks of the respondents.

² During the data collection a visit was made to Åstorp detention center. However, no permission to enter the interior of the building was granted by the staff working in the center.

5.3 Data collection: Interviews and textual material

This section provides a brief description of the data collection processes of the research. It has previously been outlined that the study is based on a sample of six respondents, and that the main sources of data are qualitative interviews, complemented by primary textual material. During the research *five* out of six planned interviews were conducted. Four of the five interviews were conducted over phone, and one face to face. The reason only five interviews were conducted was that one of the six respondents were in such a bad state at the time of the planned interview it was decided that it was better to cancel the interview. However, since the respondent still wished to share his experiences of detention, it was agreed that he would share his experiences through text. Additionally, one of the interviewees felt unable to fully express himself due to language barriers during the interview, and therefore also wished to complement his interview in written text. Whereas the five conducted interviews comprise the main source of data, the two textual materials are used as a complementary material. The length of the interviews ranged between approx. 40-90 minutes. Four of the interviews were conducted in Swedish, and one in English. A predominant part of the quotes presented in the analysis are henceforth translated by the author. The translation strives to retain the voices and language used by the respondents.

The conducted interviews followed a semi-structured to open-ended design, allowing the research to remain somewhat focused while giving scope for flexibility (Bryman 2012:472). The themes set out for the initial interview guide covered the respondents' experiences of the spatiality of the center, touched upon the experiences of stigma related to detention (in particular stigmas of criminality), as well as the respondents' experiences of access to discourse or political speech. However, throughout the data collection process the initial themes were reconfigured and new themes were added to the interview guide. For example the relation to staff-members and authorities emerged as important for the respondents, whereby it was included as a theme in the interview guide. The main focus of the interviews was to give scope for respondents themselves to lift aspects they found important. Consequently, follow-up questions and open-ended questions played an important role during the interviews.

The interviews followed a feminist methodological framework. By this meant, sensitivity was directed towards counterbalancing and limiting unequal power-relations between the researcher and the respondents (Bryman 2012:491-493). The privileged position of the researcher with regard to possessing a Swedish/European citizenship, in relation to the struggles regarding citizenship that the respondents of this study experienced was present through the data collection, and will be further discussed in section 5.6.1 *Self-reflexivity*. To mitigate unequal relations between researcher and respondent, mutuality and trust were stressed. In line with its feminist methodology the interviewer and the interviewee are regarded as co-creators of knowledge, hence focus rested on mutual learning and reciprocity (Bryman 2012:492). The interviews were conducted in easy language and in an informal tone,

striving to establish a comfortable environment for the interviewee as well as for the researcher. During each interview the purpose of the study was introduced to the respondent, likewise their anonymity and integrity in the study. Throughout the interviews respondents were free to ask questions or interrupt at any point. All respondents gave their permission to that their interviews were audiotaped, whereby the interviews were recorded and at later stage transcribed and coded. It should be noted that immigrant detention is a sensitive topic, and that individuals currently detained, or with previous experiences of detention often find themselves in marginal situations. Therefore, ethical awareness has been taken seriously when conducting the research. Ethical concerns will be further elaborated in section 5.5 *Ethical Considerations*. Meanwhile the limitations of conducting phone-interviews are acknowledged, it was during this research the only viable option. Since, respondents contacted over phone either had been deported, were residing in other parts of Sweden, or held in detention centers where the researcher was not granted access. The limitations of phone interviews will be discussed in section 5.6 *Biases and Limitations*.

5.4 Analysis: critical discourse analysis (CDA)

The collected data is analyzed through a CDA. This section presents the theoretical foundation of the analysis, as well as in short describes the coding and analysis procedure.

CDA comprises a critical stance in social research, emphasizing the role of discourse in (re)production of social inequalities (van Dijk 1993, 2015, Fairclough 2003:203, 228, Bryman 2012:536). Characteristic for *critical* discourse analysis is that it takes an explicit socio-political standpoint when addressing social inequalities (van Dijk 1993, 2015). Accordingly, CDA should always operate in solidarity with marginalized, or dominated, groups (van Dijk 1993). The ultimate purpose of a CDA is to increase critical understanding of a phenomena, and thus through discourse make visible and challenge social inequalities, ultimately striving to contribute to social change and greater social justice (van Dijk 1993, 2015, Fairclough 2003:18). One of the basic premises for CDA research is its structural focus. Henceforth power inequalities are understood as a structural phenomenon, and social problems are addressed in their socio-political context (van Dijk 1993, 2015, Bryman 2012:537, 539). CDA embeds an understanding of a dialectic relationship between discourse and social practice, seeking to *explaining* discourses rather than merely describing them (van Dijk 1993, Fairclough 2003:208, Bryman 2012:536). Recognizing that non-citizen detainees' perspectives systematically are excluded from the official discourse on immigrant detention, this research argues for the benefits of analyzing the collected data applying a CDA framework. Upcoming section will discuss the analysis and coding procedures.

5.4.1 Coding

To ensure a systematic analysis procedure data is coded using *Miles and Huberman framework for Qualitative Data Analysis* (Punch 2005:197-198). The coding procedure follows three main steps; data reduction, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusion. The three steps are undertaken in parallel throughout the analysis process. The coding framework was applied to all empiric material; the transcribed interviews and the two complementary textual documents. Data was coded using open coding. Though the themes outlined in the conceptual framework; *the spatiality of immigrant detention, criminalization, stigmatization, power and racialization*, operated as an initial theoretical lens and focus of the analysis, these categories were during the analysis reconfigured. Whereby, new themes as well sub-codes to pre-existing themes emerged, others were reformulated or removed.

The coding of the empirical material was conducted in parallel with new data collection, resulting in an ongoing process of: collection of data, refinement of existing codes, and the emergence of new ones. During the steps of data reduction the coded data was structured into broad themes with associated sub-codes. Thorough the coding process initial themes and sub-codes were restructured, some were added and others removed. The themes that emerged as most prevalent during the analysis and coding are presented in section 6: *Analysis and empirical findings*.

5.5 Ethical considerations

The following section highlights the ethical considerations that have arisen in relation to the research. First and foremost, this research stresses the importance of placing the wellbeing of the respondents as a first priority during the research. Acknowledging that experiences of detention may be a sensitive topic, strongly associated with marginalization, fear of deportation, frustration, or traumatic experiences (Canning 2019), me, in the role of researcher, did during conducted interviews act like the “*ethical researcher*” (Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014:571). Thus, expressing empathy and solidarity with the respondents when appropriate to safeguard the respondent’s wellbeing. (Klein and Williams 2012, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014). Secondly, persons who are, or have been held in immigrant detention, may have had previous bad experiences of interviews with authorities, either in their country of origin or in the receiving country. Consequently understanding must be paid to that respondents may feel reluctant towards sharing personal information with the interviewer (Klein and Williams 2012, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014). It is important that the researcher clarifies his or her independence from migration authorities by carefully explaining that the interview will neither negatively nor positively affect the outcome of the participant’s case in the asylum process (Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014). Equally important, is that the research’s aims and conditions are explained for the participant as well as the participants’ anonymity in the study. Audio-taping was only done in the cases where clear consent was given by the respondent (Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014).

Thirdly, the interview strived to be conducted in a manner that it did not place any major constraints on the respondent's personal schedule. Accordingly, respondents were allowed to decide the time/venue for corresponding interviews.

To ensure that the research holds high ethical standards, accountably on behalf of the researcher is stressed. Migrants, and in particular immigrant detainees possess fewer political rights than a person with a formal citizenship, and do therefore not retain the same ability to control how their stories are being used (Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014). Therefore, this research strives to accurately present the data, be transparent over biases, and not strip data from its context. To ensure that the voices of the respondents are accurately presented the analysis will make extensive use of quotes. The role of self-reflexivity will be discussed in the forthcoming sections of the thesis.

5.6 Biases and limitations

To ensure a transparent and ethical research, biases and limitations must be addressed. Primarily, the limited scope of the study is acknowledged. Due to the small sample size, and the uniqueness of every shared personal lived experience of immigrant detention, this study does not aspire to make any general claims. Secondly, the representativeness of the sample requires some consideration. It should be noted that all respondents in the study are men. Henceforth, 'lived experiences' of immigrant detention in this particular study are biased with regard to gender, though it lacks female perspectives. The sample is furthermore biased when it comes to the representation of respondents' (background, country of origin and age) (see Appendix 1.). Despite the embedded biases in the sample regarding gender, age, and background of respondents, the characteristics of sample nevertheless correspond to Sweden's official statistic on whom is most likely to be detained and deported (see table 1 and 2). Thus, the highest percentage of detainees held in Swedish immigrant detention facilities are men, predominantly from Afghanistan (Migrationsverket 2019).

Conducting interviews over phone imposed some minor limitations on the study, predominantly due to the inability of the researcher to observe and interpret the context of the interview. Furthermore, practical aspects such as bad signal and inadequate equipment such as headphones and mic imposed some marginal constraints during the interviews. While conducting qualitative research there is always an embedded risk of receiving biased answers from the respondents, as well as biases on behalf of the researcher when posing questions or analyzing collected data. It is accounted for that some responses might be biased in the sense that respondents left out information, or presented their experiences in a way that operated to strengthen their own cause, while presenting the perceived 'others' (authorities) in a negative light. It is also accounted for that the way questions were formulated by me as a researcher may have contributed to biased answers. The risk that the respondents may reply in a way they feel they are obliged to, which thus leads to biased information has likewise been accounted

for. Though the list of biases can be made long, biases associated to the appearance and characteristic of the researcher are elaborated in the forthcoming section.

5.6.1 Self-reflexivity

Being self-reflexive has constituted an important part of the data collection process. The advantages of bringing in a brief discussion of how personal characteristic of me as a researcher may have impacted the findings is considered fruitful with regard to that it ensures transparency throughout the research.

Me as a researcher having a migrant refugee family background, as well as a non-Swedish name, were during the interviews experienced as beneficial. Though it was experienced to facilitate a sense of mutuality and solidarity between me (as a researcher) and the respondents. No particular advantages or disadvantages related to gender-relations (i.e. being a female researcher conducting interviews with male respondents) were encountered during the research. However, the privileges of; possessing a formal citizenship, having freedom of movement, and conducting research in the role of a university student, imposed a gap between the social reality of me as a researcher and the respondents of the study, thus posed a challenge to towards establishing a sense of mutuality during the interviews.

6. Analysis and empirical findings

In the forthcoming sections the empirical data is presented and analyzed. The analysis is structured after the themes that emerged as most prevalent for the respondents of the study. The collected data has been analyzed through a Critical Discourse Analysis, in relation to the conceptual framework and reviewed literature of the thesis. Meanwhile some themes were accounted for prior to the data collection, i.e.; *respondents' perceptions of the spatiality of detention with regard to mobility and immobility, the experiences of criminalizing stigmas, experiences of lack of autonomy*, other themes emerged throughout the research process, for example; *respondents' relation to staff and authorities, aspects of wellbeing, and the respondents' sentiments of being misunderstood or silenced*. Striving to accurately display how respondents themselves drew inferences between the different categories, the empirical material is accordingly be presented structured in five broad themes, thus; *6.1 experiences and resistance of criminal stigmas, 6.2 Lived experiences of the spatiality of immigrant detention, 6.3 perspectives on autonomy, 6.4 Respondents' relations to staff and authorities, and 6.5 Being unrecognized and unrepresented*. To correctly present the findings, and to allow the voices of the respondents to be present in the empirical findings, the analysis makes extensive use of quotes.

6.1 Experiences and resistances of criminalizing stigmas

Respondents' experiences of being *wrongfully criminalized* was a dominant and reoccurring theme throughout this research. This section illustrates respondents' experiences of, as well as resistance to, criminalizing stigmas. The findings adheres with previous studies (Khosravi 2009, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019), stressing how immigrant detainees experience detention as both criminalizing and humiliating.

During the research, the sentiment of being treated as a criminal despite not having committed any criminal offense was a reoccurring theme, and was stressed (often several times), by all of the respondents. Associated to the experiences of criminalization were; frustration, feelings of being humiliated, as well as a solid resistance towards being (unrightfully) associated with criminality. All respondents carefully stressed that they had *not* committed any crime, and therefore expressed frustration and confusion to over why they were being confined. Immigrant detention was profoundly perceived like an injustice. The empirical findings indicate how the respondents deeply felt the implications of Sweden's and Europe's increasingly fear-driven migration rhetoric, where asylum seekers and irregular migrants discursively are constructed as a "*threat*" (Khosravi 2009, Baker 2012, Mountz et al. 2012:525). By emphasizing their innocence the respondents' claims echoed with resistance to contemporary criminalizing discourses:

"You know, we are not criminals. You know, we just don't have papers. We all have no resident permit. We all are not criminals." (Aamir 2019.04.18).

In his research Khosravi (2009:40) notes that "*what is brutal about the confinement of asylum seekers is that these persons are **not** held on criminal charges, but rather on their claim to be at risk of persecution*", a statement which resonates well to the lived experiences of administrative detention voiced by the respondents of this study. The empirical material indicates how the respondents felt they were being punished for being refugees and asylum seekers:

"You are being closed up there [in detention], only because you applied for asylum in this country, that is the only crime. Like, that you came here, that you fled here. Like only because you fled from the war you sit there, you end up there [in detention]." (Ramez 2019.04.18).

Recognizing immigrant detainees' marginal possibility to effectively change their situation while detained, this analysis, in accordance with the findings of Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn (2014), nonetheless suggests that current and former detainees actively use discourse (though recurrently stressing their innocence), as a mean of resisting and counteracting stigmas of criminality they feel are wrongfully imposed on them. Related to the deep frustration and humiliation of being treated like a criminal, Elias (2019.04.27), recalls how he himself, and other detainees, for security reasons, were

deprived of most of their personal belongings when entering the detention facility. For example, detainees are not allowed to use phones with cameras in the center. This aspect Elias (2019.04.27) emphasizes as humiliating, though it made him feel like if he was treated like a criminal, or a dangerous person. The prohibition of phone cameras in immigrant detention facilities does not only undermine detainees' ability to document their experiences, but also restrains their ability to contact friends and family, and may therefore have larger implications for detainees' overall wellbeing (Canning 2019). Four of the respondents witnessed how the presence of the police during transfers and deportations, usage of physical force and handcuffing, intensified their experiences and frustration over being humiliated and unjustly treated like criminals. Aamir (2019.04.18) underlines the humiliation over being escorted by the police when he needed to visit the hospital:

"They send you with the prison and probation service [kriminalvården] or the police. Just because you don't have a resident permit. What is that? You know we are not criminals or terrorists. We are just normal people. You know, we don't do anything. They all, they are all those there, they are many people, they have not done anything. They just don't have a resident permit... and then, with me something in the hand [refers to handcuffs], what is that?!" (Aamir 2019.04.18)

Aamir(2019.04.18) continues with expressing how he felt embarrassed over being escorted like a criminal, though he stated that he believed that people that saw him must perceive him as dangerous due to his escort. Amir's (2019.04.18) story illustrates the dialectic relationship between criminalizing migrant detainees, and thereby reinforcing the image of (im)migrants as criminals to the wider public (Andersson et al. 2016:16-18). Elias (2019.04.27) witnesses that by being treated like a criminal, he *felt* like a criminal, underlining how he experienced that the migration agency simply anticipated him to commit a mistake so that they could get a reason to deport him. Previous literature stress the link between criminalizing migrants and legitimizing their confinement and deportation (Khosravi 2009, Mountz et al. 2012). Accordingly, Khosravi (2009:40) argues that the *"process of criminalising asylum seekers effectively creates criminals in order to be able to punish them"*.

The process of stigmatizing a social group effectively operates to legitimize and maintain unequal social structures (Tyler and Slater 2018). Through stigmas of, for example, criminality, the individual story of the (im)migrant detainee is erased and replaced by a collective trait that justifies confinement, deportation and staff's and authorities' harsh behavior towards detainees (Mountz et al. 2012, Canning 2019). Samir (2019.04.04) expressed how he held the belief that unrightfully imposed stigmas of criminality was what had operated to justify his deportation:

"They [migration authorities] put A BAD NAME, like a 'drug dealers', or so many bad things they are doing in Sweden, or any kind of European countries. By the name of the drug dealers they are deporting us. And, so there's... so basically we are nothing of those

kind of things, but eh... they put us in a black list that we are not the good people. And, that's the easiest way that they are deceiving the people [the public]." (Samir 2019.04.04).

Pred (2000:63) frames stigmatization as a form of *violent homogenization*. Through the process of detention the individual (im)migrant is transformed into a “*detainable*” (and deportable) subject, henceforth immigrant detention effectively produces de-personalized identities (Mountz et al. 2012:527).

To sum up this section, being treated as criminal constitutes an important share of the respondents’ lived experiences of immigrant detention. The analysis shows that the respondents explicitly resisted the stigmas of criminality by repetitively stressing their innocence and underlining the injustice they were exposed to. The lived experience of criminalization emerged during the analysis in close relation to respondents’ perceptions of detention as punitive imprisonment, as well as in relation to the respondents’ perceptions of their relation to staff and authorities. However, these aspects are presented at later stages in the analysis. The upcoming section addresses the respondents’ experiences of the spatiality of immigrant detention, providing insights in the lived experiences of being involuntary immobilized meanwhile constantly moved around.

6.2 Lived experiences of the spatiality of immigrant detention

In line with Mountz et al. (2012) the empirical data of this research shows that immigrant detainees, while being made immobile through confinement, often frequently are moved around. During several occasions of the research the participants stressed deep frustration over on the one hand being deprived of their freedom through incarceration, on the hand distress and fear related to the constant risk of being deported or transferred. The perception of immigrant detention as prison was a commonly held view for all respondents in the study, and an aspect closely linked to the experiences of being unjustly treated like a criminal (displayed in previous section). The following two parts of the analysis present respondents’ perspectives experiences on how detention, on the one hand confined and immobilized them, on the other constantly threatened to moved them elsewhere, or deport them.

6.2.1 Perspectives on immobility through confinement

A commonly held view amongst all respondents was that of immigrant detention as imprisonment.

"I don't know why they don't call this a prison, but I think that here is worse than a prison" (Ali 2019.04.22)

The respondents' perceptions of *detention as a prison* resonate with previous academic research, and underlines the (growing) gap between the lived experiences of immigrant detention and the official discourse of 'administrative' confinement (Khosravi 2009, Klein and Williams 2012, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014, Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Andersson et al. 2016). Whereas the initial focus of this research was to assess respondents' perspectives on the spatial traits and processes of detention, it proved during data collection difficult to separate perceptions of space from perceptions human activity (Keating 2015). Henceforth, the spatiality of the detention centers were systematically described by the respondents in relation to sentiments of being surveilled, and in relation to lack of autonomy. The *lack of humanity* in the detention center emerged as an important part of the respondents' perceptions of immigrant detention:

"The detention center is an enclosed place that contains four big walls with security cameras like if you are inside a real prison... Every day each room is inspected five to six times per day... When you enter this place there is no humanity" (Aamir 2019.04.18)

The impression of being unduly imprisoned was a common denominator for the respondents. Elias (2019.04.27) expressed that he believed that even in prisons the prisoners had more rights than detainees in detention centers. Explaining, that in prisons every prisoner have the right to their own personal space, whereas in immigrant detention facilities detainees were forced to share rooms with each other, and subjected to *constant surveillance* by staff members. The aspect of being surveilled was pointed out as frustrating and humiliating, strongly associated with the experiences of being treated as a criminal. Elias (2019.04.27) recalled how staff members every hour open the door to the rooms to check on the detainees. The high security in the detention centers proved to reinforce the respondents' perceptions of being imprisoned:

"A local prison. So... you are not allowed to go outside whenever you touch something there is alarms starting shouting. Yeah, even you cannot open the door. If you press the window, or touch the window the alarms start beeping. Beep beep beep beep. So, it's, eh, it's very bad. (Samir 2019.04.04).

Authorities' constant control over detainees through security and surveillance can be understood as an attempt to *"reaffirm state control over migrants' bodies, even if their identities remain in question"* (Mountz et al. 2012:526-527). Two of the respondents, Elias (2019.04.27) and Tawfiq (2019.04.02), articulated how they thought of detention, and constant surveillance, as strategies used by authorities to drive them (the detainees) insane, and thereby make it easier to deport them. The respondents drew close inferences between sentiments of being surveilled, and the experiences of lack of autonomy, though the aspect of autonomy will be addressed in forthcoming sections of the analysis. The architecture of immigrant detention centers implicitly operates to isolate detainees, both from each other's and from the outside world (Mountz et a. 2012). Though Sweden internationally is acknowledged for its high material

standard and “*architectural softness*” in immigrant detention centers (Canning 2019:1), the empirical findings of this research shows how participants did not perceive the centers in relation to their architectural softness:

“Like the building it was kind of like an army base, kind of, how can I say...It felt like if it was very isolated, and it felt like kind of... it is so much, like there are guards walking outside the detention center all the time and it is like if the staff members constantly are, how can I say, like if they constantly are prepared. They... like, the building felt like an army base kind of.” (Ramez 2019.04.18)

Only one of the six respondents described the center without any major resentment towards the architecture³. Being detained was systematically mentioned in relation to lack of freedom by the respondents of the study. Not being allowed to walk freely, or prohibited to go outside more than the offset two or three hours each days, were aspects pointed out as distressing. Tawfiq (2019.04.02), Samir (2019.04.04) and Ramez (2019.04.18) all explicitly expressed their longing for nature and to be outside in contrast to their reality they faced in the center:

“We, we need freedom (!). When we haven’t done anything. We, we really need. Like being outside. When one does something we say that we have done it. You know, we are only an asylum seeker. We are nothing more. But why do we have to be locked in all the time?” (Tawfiq 2019.04.02)

The gap between the freedom outside the center, and the isolation within the center, was deeply felt by the respondents. Meanwhile exclusion can take many forms; economic, social, political, geographical (Class, Shove and Urry 2005), the aspect of the actual *spatial exclusion* that detention manifest was shown to comprise an important part of the respondents’ lived experiences of detention. Spatial exclusion inhibits interaction between detainees and the outside world, and therefore effectively operates to widen the gap between the social reality of persons inside the center, and the public outside (Mountz et al. 2012). Ramez (2019.04.18) recalls the pain he felt when seeing people outside the center enjoying their freedom, while himself being confined:

“In that room, like in all rooms, they had a window and through that window you could see people that were going for walks with their dogs, and that were biking there outside, just outside the window. And that is a really, really uncomfortable feeling when me, and other detainees sat there and talked to each other, and that was the feeling we had. You know, we had a thick curtain for the window. So that we could not see outside, because what felt so uncomfortable was that we were sitting there, with just a wall and a window

³ It should be noted that this was the only respondent in the sample who only spent a shorter time period (a few days) in detention.

between me and freedom. You know freedom, when we saw the people walk just outside, like on their strolls. You know, then I felt like, you cannot even explain what a feeling that is. Freedom is something that all humans have the right to, and need to have the right to. And there, locked in, all innocent, that is something you cannot even describe how it feels like” (Ramez 2019.04.18)

Immobilization through spatial isolation emerged as frustrating for the respondents. An aspect which was not accounted for when the research was initiated was respondents’ experiences of solitary confinement in relation to detention. However, though three of the six respondents recalled they themselves had experienced solitary or solo cell confinement during their time in detention, and five of the respondents expressed they knew someone who had been placed in solitary or isolation during their time in detention, *solitary* was incorporated as a code during the analysis process. Complete isolation through solitary was lifted as extremely distressing amongst the respondents who had experienced it. Samir (2019.04.04) describes solitary as “*hell*”. Isolation is often used as governing method in detention facilities to maintain order, not rarely filling a punitive function (Mountz et al. 2012). Meanwhile detention reinforces borders between the ‘true citizen’ and the ‘non-citizen’, solitary confinement draws borders between detainees within the center, creating categories of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ detainees (Baker 2012, Mountz et al. 2012). Tawfiq (2019.04.02) expresses fear and frustration over being put in solitary on arbitrary grounds, emphasizing how he felt that the detainees could not even raise their voices or drop something on the floor before risking to be put in solitary. Solitary confinement is often used in detention facilities to punish ‘troublemakers’ or individuals who express frustration over their situations, or to prevent detainees from self-harm (Mountz et al. 2012, Canning 2019). The use of isolation as a punishment contributes to the discursive construction of detainees as responsible for their own confinement, though it diverges attention from the structural causes of *why* frustration or self-harm occurs amongst detainees. Solitary confinement of migrants in detention essentially creates “*a prison within a prison*” (Mountz et al. 2012:531).

To sum up, this section has displayed lack of freedom and frustration over forced immobility constituted important aspects of the respondents’ experiences of immigrant detention. Furthermore respondents’ perceptions of the detention center as a prison have been lifted, drawing attention to the (growing) gap between the lived experience of immigrant detention and its official framing as virtuously administrative. Whereas the focus up to this point has been *immobilization*, forthcoming section addresses the lived experiences of being made *mobile*. Thus, highlighting paradoxical juxtaposition between immobilizing and making mobile migrants through detention.

6.2.2 Perspectives on forced mobility

The analysis shows that despite being immobilized through detention, detainees frequently face transfers. Experiences of *being moved around* appeared to comprise an important part of the respondents' day to day experiences of immigrant detention:

“There are always people who are released free, or they are deported, or they are being moved to other detention centers, and there are new people arriving all the time” (Ramez 2019.04.18).

Rather than ending mobility all together, immigrant detention operates to control and *regulate* the mobility of (unwanted) social groups (Mountz et al. 2012). Through detention, the mobility of the migrant is transformed into immobility, to facilitate *regulated* and (involuntary) transfers between different sections of the center, between different facilities, or for the purpose of deportation. By being moved around, the identity of the individual migrant is made fluid and deportable (Mountz et al. 2012). The respondents of this study expressed sentiments of lack of control over one's body and time in relation to being moved around, furthermore pointing out that the presence of the police during transfers as well as harsh behavior of staff during enforcement of deportations contributed to their experiences of being treated like a criminals.

An aspect underlined by the respondents of the study was the prevailing *fear, frustration and distress* over not knowing when and where to be moved or deported. Five of the respondents recalled experiences of when someone that they knew in the center had disappeared, and they did not know where the person had been moved, or what had happened to them. Tawfiq (2019.04.02) expressed frustration over the the obstruction he experienced when a person he knew in the center was transferred to solitary for twenty one days, whereby none of the other detainees knew what had happened to him or where he had been moved. Tawfiq's (2019.04.02) testimony exemplifies how the 'moving around' of detainees effectively undermines detainees' ability to form stronger social ties, as well as impeding their capacity to form resistance against deportations or forced transfers (Canning 2019). Forced mobility imposed on detainees shows how spatial processes are used to manifest and exercise power (Price 2009, Silverman and Massa 2012, Keating 2015). The lack of autonomy and self-determination regarding where and when to be moved is illustrated in Ramez's (2019.04.18) story:

“One experience that I want to share with you, it is like this that I had one guy that was in the same room as me. He had a wife, a four year old daughter that lived here in Sweden. But he had, you know, been taken cared of [detained], and he had been in detention for six months. And then he had applied for this one [asylum], he had appealed and he would get his notice within the next days. And then, we were sleeping during the night, and in the morning when I wake up I see that there are three policemen and also the staff in the room. And they wake that guy up, who slept next to me, and he you know, just wakes up.

“You need to pack your things, you need to go now!” And then, we who just recently woke up, we didn’t know what happened, and the three of them [the police] kind of, how can I say, strong, tough, tall policemen that stand there, that felt uncomfortable, and then I didn’t even know what they wanted to do. And the guy he asked what was happening, and “where will you... where will I go”? And they just: “No. You are not going to ask anything. Just pack your things kind of, we are going, now.” And he just “can I use the bathroom?” And they just “No. You are not allowed to use the bathroom. Just pack your things, and we are going now!” He was not even allowed to use the bathroom! That experience... what I saw in his eyes. You know, I will never forget how scared and frightened he was. We had been sitting for nights talking, grieving and cried and comforted each other. And he had talked about his daughter, his wife, and about how scared he was... And then, that morning, what I saw, you know as I told you, it is that kind of psychological torture kind of. That, ehm, he had a house you know, and he is you know afraid that now they will deport me back because now... Before when they deported people it was official, but now they deport people secretly (!). And that is what is very uncomfortable. And then, he felt as if now he was being deported, and I had the same fear, and you know, anyway in about 10 minutes he packed all his things, and he was you know kicked out from there. And you know how scared we were (!). And then after two days he called me and just “they have moved me to another detention center which is outside Gothenburg”. Yeah, and after about a month I suddenly heard that he had been released, that he had been released (!). I just, how can that happen? He just “yeah, I don’t know, they say that ‘now you will pack your things and in one week you will be deported back to Afghanistan’, but after 10 days they said ‘now you are free, you can leave from here’”. And he just “but where will I go?” and they just “Out now. We don’t know where you will go, or how. But you are not allowed to be here anymore”. This is what happens (!) you never know (!) what they want, how they plan, what they will do. It is like if...you live in an uncertainty.” (Ramez 2019.04.18)

Similar to Ramez (2019.04.18) experience, Elias (2019.04.27) emphasizes how he himself and other detainees constantly feared to be ‘secretly’ deported, though he indicated how an unofficial deportation would make any organized resistance to the deportation impossible. Sweden’s increased use of unofficial deportations of immigrant detainees are however receiving growing criticism from the civil society (Canning 2019).

To sum up, through constant transfers, immigrant detainees are not only deprived of their self-determination, but their individual identities are made “fluid” and “depersonalized” whereby their bodies are transformed into detainable and deportable entities (Mountz et al. 2012:529). Ramez’s

(2019.04.18) testimony (see quote above) implicitly demonstrates the importance of (re)personalizing individual stories. Ramez's (2019.04.18) narrative stresses how the man he encountered had a family, and a house, and feelings, thus making the experience relatable to the wider public. Closely tied to respondents' experiences of being immobilized (confined), and made mobile (moved around) were experiences of lack of autonomy, which are addressed in upcoming section.

6.3. Perspectives on autonomy: *"You know, they control my life"*

During the research, sentiments of lack of autonomy and self-determination experienced in detention appeared as a central concern for the respondents in the study, in particular for respondents who had spent longer time-periods in detention. The lack of autonomy over one's body, time and future, were often mentioned in relation to; perceptions of the center, being moved around, or surveilled and controlled by staff and migration authorities:

"it is very difficult, hard. You don't know when they [the migration agency] will send you to your country, or how life will turn out, who knows. You know, they control my life, I don't know what I should do? I just sit there two months, two months, two months..."
(Aamir 2019.04.18)

All of the respondents expressed resentment over that they felt deprived of their ability to decide over their own future and life. In the light of being deprived of their self-determination, practical aspects such as the lack of autonomy over food, time and economic resources within the center occurred as particularly frustrating:

"We can't do anything. We can't go outside either. Per 24 hours we only have three hours to spend in the outside area. Tiny bit of fresh air. Well, that's... that's it. Only that. The food and..ehm. The food and...and ehm, we have a bed that we can sleep in and water so that we can shower. But you don't have, what is it called... You don't feel well and you don't have freedom and... It is very difficult for us. The food is also the same all the time. You can't do anything yourself. It is only them [the staff] that decide and them that distribute food and. There are many people that doesn't like that food" (Tawfiq 2019.04.02)

"Yeah, they decide what time you can go outside and they...and what time you can eat, and what time you can smoke. Also what time they use computer. And with phone also. If you want to call, if you want to call it is only two times. Only two times when you are at the detention center, only two times." (Aamir 2019.04.18)

The inability to decide when and what to eat as mentioned repeatedly throughout the interviews. Elias (2019.04.27) explains that if one missed the scheduled times for breakfast, lunch or dinner one was left

without food⁴. Additionally, the bad quality of the food was pointed out by the respondents, corresponding to the findings of previous research (Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019). Meanwhile the lack of autonomy over food may appear as trivial in a situation where detainees are deprived of autonomy and self-determination over their futures, frustration over the bad food in the centers nevertheless received attention from all respondents. According to Canning (2019), being denied the ability to decide when and what to eat symbolizes deprivation of the most fundamental autonomy over one's body. In other words, what one eats affects one's health, and by depriving a person of the ability to decide what to consume that person is denied autonomy over his/her body with regard to health (Canning 2019).

Canning (2019) lifts Sweden's use of soft power in detention center, stressing the usage of recreational activities in Swedish immigrant detention facilities as strategy to keep detainees active and thereby calm. Though the respondents of this study acknowledged that there were recreational activities in the centers (i.e. play-station, a TV, and a gym) the dominating view was that it was difficult to find meaning in the time spent in detention. Aamir (2019.04.18) recalls how he experienced the time in detention as extremely frustrating, explaining he started to take drugs during his time in detention as mean of making time pass and to forget about the distress he felt related to the uncertainty of his future:

“ehm, okay, what can I say.. It is completely. It is completely sick you know. There is nothing, it is only to sit there all day. There is nothing to do there. Just sit and stay. And stay for what, who knows? You know, you don't know when you will get out. You just sit there, what happens, don't know? We don't know what will happen and so... (Aamir 2019.04.18)

Furthermore, the respondents indicated how they spent time sleeping, being on their phones, or in the gym, only to cope with the sense of *meaninglessness and uncertainty*. The feeling of being under constant surveillance was experienced as reinforcing the respondents' sentiments of being deprived of their autonomy. The lack of autonomy, uncertainty about the future, and fear of deportation experienced by persons held in immigrant detention have vast implications for detainees' wellbeing. This aspect will be addressed in the next section.

6.3.1 Immigrant detention's implications on health and wellbeing

The negative health impact of confinement on migrants' mental (and physical) wellbeing is a rather well document aspect in previous research (Khosravi 2009, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014, Debono,

⁴ Note: detainees are not allowed to prepare their own meals in detention facilities.

Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Puthooppambil, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015, Canning 2019). All of the respondents in the study reported the detrimental effect detention had on their wellbeing:

”I can only say there is no happiness here [in the detention center]. All the time you are sad, you have stress, you are worried, for when will they send you. All the time bad news. You know, every day they reject people. (silence). You don’t have, a day you don’t feel good, do you understand?” (Tawfiq 2019.04.02)

In line with existing literature (Puthooppambil, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015, Canning 2019), anxiety and sleeping problems, were pointed out by respondents. At several occasions, inadequate access to medicine and doctors (an aspect which previously received criticism in Swedish detention centers) were mentioned (Debono, Rönnqvist and Magnusson 2015, Puthooppambil, Ahlberg and Bjerneld 2015). Canning (2019) argues that *violence* implicitly is built into the institution of immigrant detention, as detainees unavoidably are subjected to emotional and mental distress in relation to being deprived of their freedom and autonomy. Equally is *threat* embedded in the existence of immigrant detention, though detainees inescapably face uncertainty and threat of a possible deportation (Canning 2019). Resignation syndrome, stress and depression are commonly reported amongst detainees (Canning 2019). Four of the respondents in this study indicated how they believed detention drove them insane:

“You become mad here (!). You know before... you feel like... you know before I was, if I know myself, I was a nice guy and I don’t know for talking...I was a good person. Now I all the time have stress. I feel like... you know I feel like if I just have a body to live with and I don’t feel like if I has a heart, that I can talk to people, I don’t have that (!). I have all the time stress coming, or anger coming. You operate like that, it is not just me, there are many that all the time sits, they laugh with themselves, they talk, they... it makes you chaos then” (Tawfiq 2019.04.02)

Suicides and suicide attempts have been recorded in Swedish detention facilities (Khosarvi 2009). Elias (2019.04.27) recalls two encounters with suicide attempts during his time in detention in Sweden. Likewise Ali (2019.04.22) indicates that he felt so bad he wanted to kill himself:

“I was sick, but I was not allowed to see a doctor, and no medicine, I was going to kill myself because I think that the staff that work there they are robots and have no emotions and do not understand anything” (Ali 2019.04.22)

To sum up, like pointed out by Ali (2019.04.02) *the lack of understanding, listening and humanity* from the staff working in the centers appeared as having a big impact on the respondents’ wellbeing. A commonly expressed concern for respondents concerned the long time-periods they had to spend in

detention⁵, again related to the uncertainty over how long exactly they would be held detained and the outcome of their detention. The forthcoming section presents the findings related to respondents' relation to staff and authorities. Though it should be noted that respondents' relation to staff and authorities were closely interlinked with sentiments of lack of autonomy and experienced implications on wellbeing.

6.4 Respondents' relations to staff and authorities

Although detainees' relations to staff members, police and migration authorities, were not accounted for when initiating the research, it proved during the data collection and analysis to comprise an important part of the respondents' lived experiences of immigrant detention. Henceforth it was included in the analysis. Coherent in the empirical material were respondents' sentiments of not being heard or listened to by staff and authorities, staff members' misuse of their power over detainees, as well as their lack of empathy, emerged as reoccurring themes. This section focuses on the respondents' experiences of their relation to the staff at the centers.

All of the respondents educed an overall difficult relationship to the staff at the centers, stressing how the staff members' lack of emotions and understanding for the respondents' situations made their time in the center difficult. In similarity to the narratives presented in Andersson et al. (2016:24-29) respondents referred to the staff as robots or machines, completely lacking emotions. Meanwhile Canning (2019:3) stresses how Sweden applies a discourse of "*kindness*", emphasizing aspects of *caring for*, and *listening to* detainees, the respondents of this study recalled a rather different relation to the employees at the centers. In contrast, the respondents of this study indicate how they many times felt neglected, criminalized and dehumanized by the staff in the detention centers:

"They simply don't care. They absolutely don't care. They don't think that the people sitting here really are humans, who also have feelings (!). Now when I say this, it feels like if talk about them all, but not all of the staff, some of them are also quite nice and beautiful people. But most of them, they are... excuse me for the language, they are completely stupid." (Ramez 2019.04.18)

The perceptions of the staff being un-caring and distant were held by all of the respondents in the study. De-humanization of detainees can be understood as strategy employed by staff, police and authorities to keep an emotional distance to the detainees, and thereby rationalize their own function as employees in the detention and deportation system (Canning 2019, Bosworth 2018). The detainees' relations to the staff were recurrently mentioned in relation to the feeling of being surveilled. Elias (2019.04.27) stresses

⁵ A majority of the respondents expected to be detained for seven months or more based on their experience of how long other detainees with similar cases to their own had been detained

how even during the time he and other detainees spent in the fenced yard outside, the staff were watching and counting them. Elias (2019.04.27) continues with underlining how he believed that the staff members were afraid too, and also suffered from stress from constantly surveilling. Ramez (2019.04.18) notes that he believes that the staff members' behavior towards detainees was a way of demonstrating power:

“They constantly try to demonstrate their power you know, like that ‘it’s me who decides’. ‘That it is me who decides, it is not you who decide’. But it is, how can you frame it, it is in an unpleasant way...and that makes it all even worse you know”. (Ramez 2019.04.18)

Elias (2019.04.27) recalls how the degrading behavior from the staff made the time in detention more difficult for the detainees. Elias (2019.04.27) states how he witnessed detainees being dragged over the floor for by staff members and police, for the purpose of deportation, underlining how he wished that the staff at least would treat detainees with respect. The lack of understanding on behalf of the staff was a prevailing theme in the respondents' testimonies. Despite the feeling of being de-humanized, Ramez (2019.04.18) explicitly expresses resentment against the bureaucratic professionalism amongst the staff members, and their inability of making exceptions and showing humanity:

“Just this I recall now, because there you have you know access to the yard until three o'clock in the winter, when it gets dark. And then, one day, I had an anxiety attack. Then I had... you know, I have like this psychological stuff that I get anxiety sometimes. And then, it was a day when I really had that anxiety, and I wanted to get out you know, to get fresh air. I really had panic you know, and then I begged to the staff. It was around 2pm, and it was still bright outside. And then I asked the staff, can you please open the door, I want to get fresh air, I haven't had fresh air in three days, I want it (!). You know I really begged, like it was my tears were dripping, I begged them. And he, who was very happy, the staff member just “No. I cannot open the door”. ”But I have the right to go outside until 3pm!” He just, “No, it is dark out there. I cannot let you out”. But it's not even dark (!), it is two o'clock in the day (!). So... what can I say, cruel are they (!). They don't show any compassion. ” (Ramez 2019.04.18).

On a similar note both Ramez (2019.04.18) and Elias (2019.04.27) demonstrate how they experienced occasions were prohibited to share their food with other detainees, and/or with visitors, despite, as stressed by Ramez (2019.04.18) no official rule stating that sharing one's food would not be allowed. The experiences of the respondents of this study correspond well with the testimonies in Andersson et al. (2016), thus the empirical material from this research display that what the respondents felt they needed was love and care, and not the feeling of being further punished.

To sum up, the discursive construction of detainees as criminal subjects can be understood as an underlying factor which rationalizes staff members' harsh behavior towards detainees (Mountz et al. 2012). The relation between detainees and authorities manifests clear power structures, where one group institutionally is legitimized to dominate over another. Bosworth (2018) emphasizes that staff in detention facilities often make sense of their (unclear) relation to detainees through racial stereotyping. Racial, in similarity to criminalized stigmas, render detainees a generalized and subordinate position, thereby facilitating staff and other authorities to keeping a moral and emotional distance from the detainees (Bosworth 2018, Canning 2019). The analysis shows that respondents felt ignored, and-or misunderstood by the employees in the centers. Additionally, the empirical material indicate detainees' feelings of not being recognized or represented in the political discourse, or by authorities. The lack of representation and recognition of migrants' discourses in official records operates to maintain the silence around contemporary expansion of detention and deportation practices in Sweden, an aspect addressed in forthcoming section of the analysis.

6.5 Being unrecognized and unrepresented

A read thread in the respondents' testimonies was their belief that the wider public did not know about their situation. This corresponds to Andersson et al.'s (2016:9) proclamation of immigrant detention as an invisible part of Swedish migration policy. Stigmatization of detainees, as well as the spatiality of the detention facility much render detainees invisible from the view of the public, structurally operating to keep detainees silent (Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019). Pred (2000:63) stresses the implication of stigmatization and normalization of discrimination, stressing how the stigmatized are *"Denied any capacity for distinctive thought or agency. Converted to the invisible. Actually present, but erased from view."* The analysis shows that the respondents of this study experience how immigrant detention in Sweden is an issue not often spoken about. Aamir (2019.04.18) states how he prior to the interview of this research never shared his experiences with anyone:

" You know so far there are many, they don't know what is detention, what means detention. Yeah, and also there is nothing in the news. We, I, said nothing. And it happens to many people for sure, for example it is one day, two people they break a window, it came many people fighting with each other, and fighting with the police, but I said nothing in the news. Why? That... I don't know what happens..." (Aamir 2019. 04.18)

"You know I tell you, I said nothing about the detention. You know I said nothing that speaks about the detention. That is why I speak to you today. I hope that more and more will understand what detention means and why... and these kind of stuff" (Aamir 2019.04.18).

Detainees' perspectives on immigrant detention are vastly absent from public discourse, further more un-or, underrepresented in news or media. The constraint placed on detainees in accessing discourse can in itself be understood as a manifestation of power imbalance, though dominant groups often control and steer public discourses to their own advantage (van Dijk 1993). Moreover, non-citizens' claims may risk to pass unrecognized, or framed as non-political. Though, being recognized as a political agent is closely tied to being a citizen, non-citizens are left in a marginal position when calling for political listening (Miller 2011). The respondents of this study repeatedly stressed how they felt that no one that had not him/herself experienced immigrant detention could fully understand their situations:

“But if you have not been in the situation, I’m 100% sure if that you won’t feel like I’m, like I feel. Even if I talk to anybody like that, they will not feel me. Eh, but, if you try one day yourself, if you block the door for yourself, and you don’t go outside, then... then you feel. Keep out eh... keep the phone out of the reach of yourself. Then you will understand how it feels really for yourself if you’re in solitary” (Samir 2019.04.04)

”Well, what you can hear how others may tell that they can feel, they are for their life, it is always different from what you yourself get to experience when you end up in that situation... So, before I heard on others how scared they were, but when it was me who sat there, and how worried I was. That is you know a totally different feeling” (Ramez 2019.04.18)

Tawfiq (2019.04.02), in agreement with several other of the respondents of the study, voiced disappointment over the degrading behavior that he had experienced in the Swedish detention, and deportation system, emphasizing how they had thought of Sweden as a country where they would be met by humanity and safety:

“I think that there are no people in the world that can understand... Now I just can understand that these politicians they cannot understand us. All the time when I came to Sweden I... I didn’t know that Sweden is a good country, but people talk all the time, that Sweden is a good country that talks about security, rights, do you understand. But I know, because I come from a country where they can understand people. Where they can understand humans. The situation. When I came here everything was different, do you understand? Well, yeah, that’s how it is.” (Tawfiq 2019.04.02).

The analysis illustrates how the respondent strongly felt Sweden’s increasingly restrictive migration policy. Elias (2019.04.27) stressed during the interview how he experienced the situations for migrants and asylum seekers to be worse for every day, referring to Sweden’s increasingly deportation focused detention system. He witnessed that from all of the persons he met in detention, he was one of the few had been released and granted a resident permit. This experienced was shared by both Ramez (2019.04.18) and Aamir (2019.04.18). Besides, the respondents emphasized how their voices where

neither represented nor recognized in the political domain. Ramez (2019.04.18) explicitly voiced frustration over how Sweden increasingly invests financial resources into expanding its immigrant detention and deportation system. Thus, as Ramez (2019.04.18) phrased it, the same resources spent on keeping people locked up, could instead have been used to give these people a chance to contribute to society. Ramez (2019.04.18) stresses the growing gap between his lived experiences of immigrant detention and Sweden's political discourse on increased expansion of current detention capacity:

” The politicians that are in the government, they seem very secure with their nice suits. They don't care at all. They try to invest more money to, you know, create more detention, to place people there, to lock people up there, and many more. And they don't even care. They have completely forgot that these people that are in detention, they are not criminals. They are people that have been seeking asylum in this country. That have fled to get safety and freedom here.” (Ramez 2019.04.18)

To sum up, the analysis illustrates that the respondents feel that their realities are not represented, nor understood in the public and political discourse on immigrant detention. Van Dijk (1993) stresses the importance of access to discourse in recognizing power imbalances. This analysis suggests that meanwhile detainees are subjected to an increasingly restrictive policy environment, their actual lived experiences of immigrant detention remains absent from public discourse. Furthermore, immigrant detainees' ability to access discourse, and to be recognized as political agents are heavily restricted in the contemporary system (Miller 2011).

6.6 Summary of analysis

The empirical findings of this research adheres to previous qualitative studies on immigrant detention, in Sweden as well as in other European contexts (Khosravi 2009, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluyn 2014, Andersson et al. 2016). The analysis suggests that administrative immigrant detention is experienced as imprisonment and as a deep injustice by detainees' themselves. Prevalent in the analysis were respondents' experiences of being treated as criminals, as well as their resistance to such affiliations. Furthermore, perceptions of detention as a prison, distress over being surveilled, and lack of autonomy over one's time and body were aspects lifted by the respondents of the study. The analysis has shown, in coherence with Mountz et al. (2012) that immigrant detainees are both immobilized and made mobile through detention. Throughout the analysis respondents' experiences of power dominance and abuse from the staff and authorities, likewise the lack of humanity and understanding they met while in detention, were considered causes of distress. Sweden's increasingly deportation focused migration policy, and increased use of 'secret' deportations were indicated to contribute to fear and distress amongst the participants of the research. In the upcoming section: *Concluding discussion*, the research question will be answered followed by a brief concluding discussion.

7. Concluding discussion

This thesis has explored: *immigrant detainees' lived experiences of immigrant detention in Sweden, in the light of Sweden's ongoing expansion of its detention capacity*. Through the formulation of the research inquiry the study has sought to capture the linkages between the micro-level lived experience of administrative confinement on the one hand, and its broader structural context on the other (van Dijk 1993). It should be noted that this thesis has been limited in its scale and scope, whereby no generalized claims can be made. Nevertheless, the research is considered to have contributed with valuable insights to the lived experiences of contemporary immigrant detention in Sweden, adding to existing body of critical research on the topic (Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson et al. 2016, Canning 2019).

The research draws the conclusion that Sweden's increasingly restrictive and more deportation focused migration policy profoundly is felt amongst persons that are, or have been held in immigrant detention, a claim that is based on the empirical findings of the research. The analysis has revealed respondents' frustration over how Sweden is diverging increased financial resources into expanding its immigrant detention capacity, as well as illustrated respondents' deep distress related to Sweden's increased use of unofficial deportations (Ramez 2019.04.18, Elias 2019.04.27). The findings of the research resonate with previous qualitative studies on immigrant detention (Khosravi 2009, Lietaert, Broekaert and Derluy 2014, Andersson et al. 2016), demonstrating how the lived experiences of administrative confinement is characterized by detainees sentiments of being *treated as criminals*, despite not having committed any crime. Likewise the *perceptions of being punished* for being an asylum seeker or a refugee were stressed by the respondents (Khosravi 2009, Andersson et al. 2016:24-29). In accordance with the testimonies presented Andersson et al.'s (2016:24-29) anthology, this research emphasis how detainees feel mistreated and ignored by staff and authorities. Based on its analysis, and supported by previous studies, this thesis concludes that immigrant detention in Sweden both is underpinned by the discursive criminalization of (im)migrants, as well as effectively operates to reinforce the image of (im)migrants, and in particular, immigrant detainees, as criminals (Mountz et al. 2012, Andersson 2016:16-18). The thesis suggests that the spatiality of immigrant detention provides a rich site of analysis when seeking to understand, and make visible, unequal and racialized social relations. Though it is in accordance with Pred (2000:111) acknowledged how space and identity are deeply intertwined.

This thesis has aimed to increase critical understanding of immigrant detention in Sweden by giving voice to immigrant detainees. The analysis demonstrates that a reoccurring concern for the respondents of this study was that they felt how their realities and lived experiences were being ignored and/or misunderstood. As presented in the analysis, the lack of humanity in the migration system was stressed, and respondents expressed how they experienced being de-personalized and not treated as

humans. In solidarity with the participants of study, as well as with the many others who face hardships in an increasingly restrictive migration policy environment, this research wishes to emphasize the significance of *re*-personalizing marginalized voices. Whereas immigrant detention effectively operates through silencing and de-personalizing immigrant detainees', this thesis argues for the importance of counteracting such discourse. The importance for more critical research on immigrant detention in Sweden is therefore stressed. Concurrently, the thesis holds the hope that future research will continue to shed awareness on the lived experiences of administrative confinement, operating to counteract wrongfully imposed stigmas. It is henceforth aspired that more scholarly work will be directed towards giving immigrant detainees' access to discourse and ability to define their own realities, and thereby contributing to greater social justice (van Dijk 1993, 2015). As a concluding remark, I wish to end this thesis with the words of Aamir (2019.04.18), of one of the respondents of the study: "*Maybe, maybe it will be better if many people know what is 'förvaret' [detention], and what they do in detention (!). I don't only want them to know what means detention, I also what to know what happens in detention*".

Bibliography

Aliens Act (2005:716) Sweden 31 March 2006. [online] Available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b50a1c.html> [Accessed 25 May. 2019].

Andersson, U., Hermansson, E., Myritz, L. and Stenqvist, T. (2016). *Flyktingfångelser - en antologi om migrationsverkets förvar*. Pozkal: Verbal förlag.

Barker, V. (2012). Global Mobility and Penal Order: Criminalizing Migration, A View from Europe. *Sociology Compass*, 6(2), pp.113-121.

Berglund, E. (2016). Rights, Inclusion and Free Movement: Social Rights and Citizenship in the European Union, *Networked Digital Library of Theses & Dissertations*

Bosworth, M. (2018). 'Working in this Place Turns You Racist'. In: M. Bosworth, A. Parmar and Y. Vázquez, ed., *Race, Criminal Justice, and Migration Control: Enforcing the Boundaries of Belonging*, 1st ed. Oxford University Press,.

Bresnahan, M. and Zhuang, J. (2016). Detrimental Effects of Community-Based Stigma. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(11), pp.1283-1292.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Canning, V. (2019). Keeping up with the kladdkaka: Kindness and coercion in Swedish immigration detention centres. *European Journal of Criminology*, p.147737081882062.

Class, N., Shove, E. and Urry, J. (2005) Social exclusion, mobility and access, *The Sociological Review*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Debono, D., Rönqvist, S., and Magnusson, K. (2015). *Humane And Dignified?: Migrants' Experiences Of Living In A 'State Of Deportability' In Sweden*, n.p.: Malmö : Malmö University, MIM

de Haas, H. (2010). Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective. *International Migration Review*, 44(1), pp.227-264.

Easterling, B. and Feldmeyer, B. (2017). Race, Incarceration, and Motherhood. *The Prison Journal*, 97(2), pp.143-165.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse*. London: Routledge

FARR (2017). *Country Report: Sweden 2017*. [online] Asylum Information Database (AIDA). Available at: <http://www.asylumineurope.org/reports/country/sweden> [Accessed 27 Mar. 2019].

Global Detention Project (2018). *Immigration Detention in Sweden: Increasing Restrictions and Deportations, Growing Civil Society Resistance*. [online] Available at: <http://www.globaldetentionproject.org> [Accessed 23 Mar. 2019].

Global Detention Project | Mapping immigration detention around the world. (2019). *countries - Global Detention Project | Mapping immigration detention around the world*. [online] Available at: <https://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/europe/sweden> [Accessed 8 Jan. 2019].

Keating E. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: D. Tannen, H. Hamilton and D. Schiffrin, ed., *The handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, pp.244-255.

Khosravi, S. (2009). Sweden: detention and deportation of asylum seekers. *Race & Class* Copyright © 2009 Institute of Race Relations, 50(4), pp.38–56.

Klein, A. and Williams, L. (2012). Immigration Detention in the Community: Research on the Experiences of Migrants Released from Detention Centres in the UK. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(6), pp.741-753. 14

Leyro, S. and Stageman, D. (2018). Crimmigration, Deportability and the Social Exclusion of Noncitizen Immigrants. *MIGRATION LETTERS*, 15(2), pp.255-265.

Lietaert, I., Broekaert, E. and Derluyn, I. (2014). The Lived Experiences of Migrants in Detention. *Population, Space and Place*, 21(6), pp.568-579.

Mahtani, M. (2014). Toxic geographies: absences in critical race thought and practice in social and cultural geography. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 15(4), pp.359-367.

Menjívar, C., Gómez Cervantes, A. and Alvord, D. (2018). The expansion of “crimmigration,” mass detention, and deportation. *Sociology Compass*, 12(4), p.e12573.

Migrationsverket (2019). *Migrationsverkets årsredovisning 2018*. [online] Migrationsverket. Available at: https://www.migrationsverket.se/download/18.748d859516793fb65f91654/1550847536193/Migration_sverket_%C3%85rsredovisning_2018.pdf?fbclid=IwAR14s5VHz1_xjrwapf15p88_mv1YZ2bmY7dm2exRVHZscpu8ljsuDivS0A [Accessed 20 Apr. 2019].

Migrationsverket.se. (2019). *Detention and supervision*. [online] Available at: <https://www.migrationsverket.se/English/Private-individuals/Detention-and-supervision.html> [Accessed 9 Jan. 2019].

Millner, N. (2011). From “refugee” to “migrant” in Calais solidarity activism: Re-staging undocumented migration for a future politics of asylum. *Political Geography*, 30(6), pp.320-328.

Mountz, A., Coddington, K., Catania, R., and Loyd, J. (2013). Conceptualizing detention: Mobility, containment, bordering, and exclusion. *Progress In Human Geography*, 37 (4), pp. 522-54.

Nash, C. (2003). Cultural geography: anti-racist geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(5), pp.637-648.

Pred, A. (2000). *Even in Sweden, Calif.*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Price, P. (2009). At the crossroads: critical race theory and critical geographies of race. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(2), pp.147-174.

Punch, KF. (2005). *Introduction To Social Research: Quantitative And Qualitative Approaches*, n.p.: London: SAGE.

Puthoopparambil, S., Ahlberg, B. and Bjerneld, M. (2015). “A prison with extra flavours”: experiences of immigrants in Swedish immigration detention centres. *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care*, 11(2), pp.73-85.

Robinson, C. (2017). Tracing and explaining securitization: Social mechanisms, process tracing and the securitization of irregular migration, *Security Dialogue*, 48 (6), pp. 505-523.

Šalamon, N. (2017). Mass Migration, Crimmigration and Defiance. *Southeastern Europe*, 41(3), pp.251-275.

Schuster, L. and Majidi, N. (2014). Deportation Stigma and Re-migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(4), pp.635-652.

Silverman, S. and Massa, E. (2012). Why Immigration Detention is Unique. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(6), pp.677-686.

Tyler, I. and Slater, T. (2018). Rethinking the sociology of stigma. *The Sociological Review*, 66(4), pp.721-743.

van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), pp.249-283.

van Dijk, T. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: D. Tannen, H. Hamilton and D. Schiffrin, ed., *The handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, pp.466-479.

Wacquant, L., Slater, T. and Pereira, V. (2014). Territorial Stigmatization in Action. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 46(6), pp.1270-1280 15

Wodak, R. & Reisigl, M. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: D. Tannen, H. Hamilton and D. Schiffrin, ed., *The handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, pp.576-590.

Appendix 1: List of respondents

The following list presents the respondents of the study. To protect the anonymity of the participants each respondent has been granted a fictive name. At the time of the research the respondents were in the ages of 19- 26. Four of the respondents were from Afghanistan, one of the respondents from Iran, and one from Morocco. All of the respondents had lived in Sweden for one or several years prior their detention.

- Respondent 1: **Tawfiq** (phone interview 2nd of April 2019)

At the time of the interview Tawfiq had been detained for five months in Flen detention center, and expressed that he believed he would be held confined for an additional one or two months.

- Respondent 2: **Samir** (phone interview 4th of April 2019)

At the time of the interview Samir had already been deported to Afghanistan. He recalled he was deported in December 2018. Prior his deportation Samir was held for a shorter time (in total a few days) in three different detention facilities; Kållered, Åstorp and Märsta, as well as in solitary confinement

- Respondent 3: **Ramez** (phone interview 18th of April 2019)

At the time of the interview Ramez had been granted a resident permit and was living in Sweden. He recalled he had been released from detention in early January 2018, after spending three months in Flen detention center.

- Respondent 4: **Aamir** (phone interview 18th of April, textual complement to interview 22nd of April)

At the time of the interview Aamir states that it was three or four months since he had been released from detention. Aamir recalls that he spent in total ten months in detention in Sweden; four months in Kållered and six months in Åstorp.

- Respondent 5: **Ali** (textual material 22nd of April 2019)

At the time when Ali shared his experiences from detention he was currently detained, and had been held in Märsta detention center for four months.

- Respondent 6: Elias (face to face interview 27th of April 2019)

At the time of the interview Elias recently got his resident permit in Sweden. Elias was detained for two months, in Åstorp and in Kållerød, and recalled that he was released in early 2019. Elias states that prior his detention, he lived almost four years as paperless in Sweden. Furthermore, he shares that he earlier in his life experienced 19 months in immigrant detention in Greece.