



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

**Social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants**  
Comparative Analysis From the Perspective of Third Sector Organisations in  
Gothenburg and Copenhagen

Master's Programme in Social Work and Human Rights  
Degree report 30 higher education credit  
Spring 2018  
Author: Lilja Sif Thorisdottir  
Supervisor: Agneta Hedblom

## Abstract

**Title:** Social Exclusion and Discrimination of Vulnerable EU Migrants: Comparative Analysis From the Perspective of Third Sector Organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen

**Author:** Lilja Sif Thorisdottir

**Key words:** Vulnerable EU migrants, Third Sector Organisations, Social Citizenship, Social Exclusion/Inclusion, Discrimination

After the EU enlargements in 2004 and 2007, an increased migration has occurred within the EU borders. The right to free movement has made mobility possible within the Member States without any resident permit. Migration from Central and Eastern European Member States to Scandinavia as also increased the past years, but with hard registration restrictions of the welfare states, the situation has led to social problems of the EU migrants. These problems mostly comprise of social exclusion and discrimination towards the migrants. In light of that this study is a comparative analysis of third sector organisations perspectives in Gothenburg and Copenhagen when it comes to social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants. The study aimed to look at how the third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen are working towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants, and how are and could the involvement of local, national and EU authorities play a part. The aim was also to reflect upon, from the organisations perspective, how local and national authorities take into consideration the entitlement of social citizenship within the EU, and how that could affect the situation of social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen. The form of the research was qualitative semi-structured interviews with six organisations, three in Gothenburg and three in Copenhagen that work with vulnerable EU migrants. The findings showed that the main difference between Gothenburg and Copenhagen when it comes to strategies is due to the diversity within the target group. In Gothenburg, it is more common than in Copenhagen to find families who have migrated, therefore migrating with children. Furthermore, it is more likely to find Roma among the EU migrants in Gothenburg. In Copenhagen, the migrants are mostly non-Roma that have additional social problems to vulnerability, such as mental illnesses and substance abuse. The findings also showed that Gothenburg appears to take more part in the work than Copenhagen both when it comes to decreasing social exclusion and discrimination, and consider social citizenship of EU to a more extent. On a national level, similarities can more clearly be identified, as both national authorities have taken minimum action towards EU migrants. They also appear to consider social citizenship of EU to a minimum extent with obstacles in the registration process of the welfare system.

## Acknowledgements

Without family and friends, this study would not have been a possibility. From the bottom of my heart, I thank my fiancé Ragnar and my son Dagur Óli for endless support and patience, ég elska ykkur meira en allt annað.

My parents and parents in law, you have shown a support that cannot be measured and without you on the side cheering me on and especially for my parents in law flying over to Gothenburg from Iceland to help us the last weeks before handing in the thesis is the kindest gesture and I cannot thank you enough.

My fellow students, you know who you are, I could not have done this without you. I am not only grateful for your support but also for our friendship that will last a lifetime.

I would like to thank my supervisor Agneta Hedblom for her support and guidance. I would also like to thank the participants of this study that took their time to meet with me. I would like to complement their selfless work with a group of people that do not have many places to turn to. In the systematic world, we live in, you are doing an excellent job, and for that I thank you.

## Table of contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Table of contents</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.1. Problem formulation</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.2. Research aims</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1.3. Research questions</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1.4. Terminology</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1.5. Relevance of the study to social work and human rights</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.6. Structure of the study</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Background</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1. Migration within EU</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2. Vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden/Gothenburg</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3. Vulnerable EU migrants in Denmark/Copenhagen</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>2.4. Roma</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>3. Literature review</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>3.1. Previous studies from Sweden/Gothenburg</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>3.2. Previous studies from Denmark/Copenhagen</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>3.3. EU migration policies and regulations</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.3.1. Roma strategies within EU.....	19
<b>4. Theoretical framework</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>4.1. Social citizenship</b> .....	<b>21</b>
4.1.1. Social rights.....	22
<b>4.2. Social exclusion/inclusion</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>4.3. Discrimination</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>5. Research design and methods</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>5.1. Design of the study</b> .....	<b>27</b>
5.1.1. Comparative study .....	28
<b>5.2. Collection of data</b> .....	<b>28</b>
5.2.1. Interview process and participants.....	29
5.2.2. Transcription.....	30
<b>5.3. Method of analysis</b> .....	<b>30</b>
5.3.1. Validity, reliability, and generalizability .....	31
<b>5.4. Ethical consideration</b> .....	<b>32</b>
5.4.1. Informed consent and confidentiality .....	32
5.4.2. Invasion of privacy and deception .....	33
5.4.3. Language and interpretation .....	34
<b>5.5. Limitations</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>5.6. Reflection of methodology</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>6. Findings</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>6.1. Strategies</b> .....	<b>37</b>
6.1.1. Approaches .....	37
Long term solutions and stabilisation.....	37
Battling poverty, education and rights .....	38
Lobbying and advocating .....	38
Collaboration with the media and other actors .....	39

Discussion .....	40
6.1.2. Improvements .....	40
Collaboration and influence .....	40
Housing .....	41
Discussion .....	42
<b>6.2. Authorities .....</b>	<b>42</b>
6.2.1. Responsibility .....	42
On local, national and EU level .....	42
Differences on the local level .....	44
Discussion .....	45
6.2.2. Improvements .....	45
Politics and funds .....	45
Understanding of EU laws .....	46
The situation of EU migrants .....	46
Health care and shelters .....	47
Discussion .....	48
<b>6.3. EU citizenship .....</b>	<b>48</b>
6.3.1. Obstacles .....	48
6.3.1.1. Welfare system .....	49
The problem with national authorities .....	49
Legislative changes .....	49
Discussion .....	51
<b>7. Analysis .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>7.1. Strategies .....</b>	<b>52</b>
Long term solutions and integration .....	52
Collaboration .....	53
<b>7.2. Authorities .....</b>	<b>53</b>
Authorities on the local and the national level .....	53
The responsibility of the third sector .....	54
The participation of EU .....	55
<b>7.3. EU citizenship .....</b>	<b>56</b>
Obstacles due to national authorities .....	56
Obstacles towards social citizenship of EU .....	56
<b>8. Concluding discussion .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>8.1. Summary .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>8.2. Recommendation for further research .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Informed consent 1 .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Informed consent 2 .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Information sheet .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Interview guide - Gothenburg .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Interview guide - Copenhagen .....</b>	<b>76</b>

## List of Abbreviations

BEUCITIZEN	Barriers Towards EU Citizenship
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EU	European Union
GA	General Assembly
HSO	Human Service Organisation
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICESER	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Workers and Members of Their Families
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

# 1. Introduction

*“[...] [b]ecause of the welfare system we are not used to have people here who are not included in the welfare system and we don't have the laws and the rights even though the EU laws are very I think...they are very easy and they should have the same rights but they don't have so what they get right now is they can go to the hospital but only as long as it's emergency and an example could be, it's a real example umm...homeless man from Poland who got hit by a car because he was drunk and all kind of stuff but he got hit by a car and his leg breaks he goes to the hospital and they get an operation and after the operation it's not emergency anymore so they put him on the street and then his leg breaks again and he get's a new operation and after four operations they have to remove half of his leg.” (C1).*

This extract is a response given in one of the interviews conducted for this study and illustrates the overall view of the situation of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen. Exclusive access to Scandinavian welfare systems has made cases like these a reality, despite the existing EU laws emphasising inclusive actions. Due to exclusive access, the third sector organisations within Scandinavia have taken a significant role in providing services to vulnerable EU migrants (Spehar et al., 2017) who mostly originate from Central and Eastern Europe. Their vulnerability is characterised by poverty, homelessness, unemployment, and in some cases poor health conditions (Djuve et al., 2015). The third sector organisations are defined as non-state-public services and comprise mostly of civil society, non-profit and voluntary organisations (Vamstad, 2007).

This chapter is an introduction to a comparative study on the vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen. The study focuses on examining the perspective of third sector organisations on social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants, in addition to their understanding of the entitlement connected to the social citizenship of EU. The next chapter will give a more comprehensive overview on the situation and will follow with research aims and questions, description on the target groups as well as the relevance of the study to social work and human rights.

## 1.1. Problem formulation

Migration flow within the EU has increased over the last decade particularly after the EU enlargement of 2004 and 2007. In 2004, ten countries joined the EU, eight of them being members of the former Yugoslavia, followed by the accession of Romania and Bulgaria in 2007 (Recchi and Triandafyllidou, 2010). One of the core values of EU is the right to free movement<sup>1</sup>, meaning that citizens of EU can enter other EU countries for up to three months as tourists, and for six months as jobseekers. As a result, a high level of migration has occurred from the new Member States to the established ones (Lindley, 2011). Evidence has shown that the number of homeless migrants from EU countries has increased, particularly after the enlargements. The migrants are facing barriers that increase the odds of vulnerability to homelessness. Those barriers are legal and social rights, their status as migrants and vulnerable circumstances on labour and housing market (Mostowska, 2014). At the same

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 46 of the EU Charter (European Union, 2012)

time, the attitudes towards the enlargements among the inhabitants of the EU have become increasingly negative (Sedelmeier, 2014).

Scandinavian countries have experienced migration flow from marginalised societies in Central and Eastern European countries after both enlargements. Sweden and Denmark are both Member States within the EU and therefore a part of the free movement within EU borders (Djuve et al. 2015). In the context of migration flow within the EU, certain pull and push factors can be identified. Push factors, defined by IOM, refer to circumstances and conditions in the country of origin that push people to leave their country whereas pull factor points to the elements that are attractive in the destination country (IOM, n.d.a). When it comes to migration from Eastern Europe to Scandinavia and other Western European countries, a state of poverty the migrants face in their home countries and the need to provide to their families have pushed many of them to migrate. On the other hand, the free movement within the EU territory has undoubtedly been a major pull factor that has led to migration, and there have also been arguments regarding the attraction to Scandinavian social welfare systems. The welfare systems have been painted as a generous benefit magnet for people in need and could thus be considered as pull factor (Sainsbury, 2012). However, other studies have not confirmed these arguments. Gerdes and Wadensjö (2013), who have analysed migration to Sweden after both EU enlargements, argue against social welfare benefits being a pull factor. Also, the findings of Hooghe et al. (2008) show that the economy and labour market play more significant role than social welfare systems. Amundson's (2017) findings have also demonstrated that social welfare is not an attractive factor to the migrants, as they are in most cases excluded from receiving any social welfare.

Olwig (2011) points out that the Scandinavian countries have addressed the problems connected to vulnerable EU migrants in very different ways. Denmark has appeared to be a more closed society with increased restriction of immigration policies while Sweden has appeared to become more progressive, multicultural and liberal in their policy development. Moreover, Olwig (2011) notes that the international outlook has been quite the opposite between these two countries. Denmark has been perceived as “narrow-minded, xenophobic and discriminatory society” (ibid., p.184). The perception of Sweden has been “society with a progressive political stance on cultural diversity and the right to equality for all.” (ibid., p.184). Wiesbrock (2011) further argues that Swedish integration policies are diverse from other EU countries such as Denmark. According to Jørgensen (2012), integration conditions of EU Member States are said to have increased its restrictions, particularly Denmark, as it is one of the most restrictive and controlling integration regimes in the EU. Wiesbrock (2011) notes that Sweden and Denmark in many ways have had similar starting position when it comes to immigration. Historically they have experienced similar immigrant population, and there are similarities of both welfare systems. Nonetheless, they have had diverse paths to integration policies. Sweden has been more multicultural in comparison to Denmark, and to other EU countries.

However, according to Brännström et al. (2018), Sweden has gone through many changes within integration policies the past years. Changes have mainly been directed towards the labour market, as that has been expressed to be the key to social inclusion. Therefore, the aim has gradually shifted from the rights of immigrants towards the responsibilities of immigrants. Likewise, the realisations of integration policies have shifted from the national government agency to the municipalities, and as a result given other actors of the society like private organisations the responsibility to perform integration work. Danish integration policies, on the other hand, have turned into political difficulties as a combination of national and local



integration policies have brought out a disagreement between the two levels (Jørgensen, 2012). The reason for the differences on both levels can either be explained through discourse and practice gap, as national policies have unsuccessfully been transferred to municipalities or through disagreement on political matters. The state is being protective of its citizens by excluding immigrants whereas municipalities look at immigration as beneficial to all and therefore emphasise inclusion (ibid.).

Despite differences in the policy approaches, the issue of vulnerable EU migrants has quickly become a social problem in Sweden and Denmark. The third sector organisations have become the leading actors in providing social and basic support to the migrant population (Djuve et al., 2015; Spehar et al., 2017; Jørgensen and Thomsen, 2013). In Sweden, studies have shown that municipalities have failed to address the challenges with effective policy formulations and instead, the third sector organisations have become responsible for the migrants' well-being (Spehar et al., 2017). The city of Gothenburg has, however, since 2013 collaborated with organisations within the third sector that offer assistance to the vulnerable EU migrants (Göteborg Stad, 2016). In Copenhagen, the integration policies, since the late 1990s, have mostly been focused on refugees and immigrants from non-Western countries and to some extent left out integration actions for labour migrants from the new EU Member States (Jørgensen & Thomsen, 2013). Furthermore, according to NGOs in Copenhagen, who are working with vulnerable EU migrants, there is a lack of economic resources and general local policies, and due to this, vulnerable EU migrants are living on the streets of Copenhagen (Vertelyte, 2016).

The reasons behind choosing the cities of Gothenburg and Copenhagen for this study are mostly due to their similarities. The two countries are both parts of the EU and Scandinavia, and both countries have welfare systems that however appear to be diverse, particularly within migration policies. Nevertheless, the third sector organisations have driven the work with vulnerable EU migrants in both cities. Therefore within two similar examples, can there be identified diversity? In the following chapters, both reach aims and questions will be further distinguished.

## **1.2. Research aims**

The aim of the study is to look at what are the strategies of third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants, and how from the organisations perspective are and could the involvement of local national and EU authorities make a change. The aim is furthermore to reflect upon, from the organisations perspective, how local and national authorities consider the entitlement of social citizenship within the EU, and how that can affect the situation of social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen.

## **1.3. Research questions**

- 1) How are the third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen working towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants?
  - How are and could authorities play a part?

From the perspective of the thirds sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen:

2) How are the local and national authorities in Gothenburg and Copenhagen taking into consideration the entitlement of social citizenship of EU in relation to vulnerable EU migrants?

In the context of the questions above:

3) Can there be identified diversity between Gothenburg and Copenhagen?

#### 1.4. Terminology

Due to the complexity and diversity of the target group, the used terminology requires further consideration. Many studies and reports show that majority of the vulnerable EU migrants in both Sweden and Denmark originates either from Romania and Bulgaria (Kastanje and Hoff, 2017; Djuve et al., 2015; SOU, 2016). Furthermore, many reports and studies also show that majority of the Romanian and Bulgarian citizens arriving in Sweden belong to the ethnic Roma population (Nygren and Nyhlén, 2017; Djuve et al. 2015). According to Gothenburg's action plan for vulnerable EU migrants, Roma from Romania and Bulgaria are also the majority of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg (Göteborg Stad, 2016). In Denmark and Copenhagen however, the majority of the vulnerable EU migrants are non-Roma but also from Romania (Djuve et al., 2015; Kastanje and Hoff, 2017). With that in mind, the discourse of this study will be more reflective on migrants from Romania and Bulgaria, however, without excluding the migrants originating from other Central and Eastern European countries.

In the context of the term EU migrant, it is important to consider other concepts such as nationality, EU citizenship and migration, as they assist on clarifying the use of the term in this study. Kruma (2014) notes that nationality is the basis of an individual being a member of a particular community and Schutter (2009) argues that nationality can be understood as members of a national minority, such as Roma. EU citizenship, however, is said to be an additional status to Member State nationality (Kruma, 2014), and co-exists alongside the national citizenship. Kruma (2014) moreover emphasised that the concept of EU citizenship is not independent of nationality, but instead "EU law is primarily, but not exclusively, concerned with situations where national reside outside their country of nationality" (ibid., p.418).

Migration is defined by IOM (n.d.-b) as a "movement of a person or a group of persons, either across international borders, or within a state [...]; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants, and persons moving for other purposes, including family reunification." The definition of migrant is "any person who is moving or has moved across an international border or within a State away from his/her habitual place of residence" (IOM, n.d.-b). By considering these concepts when referring to EU migrants, it clarifies that within this study, this group of people have the nationality of specific countries and those countries are a part of the EU, which adds to their status as EU citizens. However, when they are not residing in their own country and have made a move internationally, even within the Member States of EU, they fall under the definition of migrants.

However, there exists a debate on whether the term ‘migrant’ can be used within the EU borders. Citizens of Member States enjoy the right to free movement without a residence permit, and therefore it has been claimed that the term ‘EU migrant’ should rather be referred to as ‘EU citizen’. The argument is not only built on the right of free movement, but the negative connotation of the term ‘migrant’ has also been a reason to preferably use the term of EU citizens. EU migrant is said to have rather the impact of depriving them of their rights rather than supplying them with rights (Nygryn and Nyhlén, 2017). However, despite the negative connotations of the term ‘migrant’, it will be utilised in this study. It will not be used for depriving them of their rights as EU citizens or implying that this terminology is more right than the other. It will be used on the ground of Kruma’s (2004) argument that national citizenship is more substantial than EU citizenship in relation to the IOM (n.d.b) definition of the term migrant. Moreover, when researching and building up the background for this study, other studies and literature, in most cases, have used term migrant instead of a citizen.

The term of the target group is yet not all migrants who fall under the category of EU migrant, meaning anyone who has made a move from one Member State to another. Therefore the word ‘vulnerability’ is used to give the concept more particular meaning, and to include individuals who live under similar circumstances. The definition of vulnerability in this study is similar to Hoogeveen et al. (2004) definition as “linkages between poverty and risk define the concept of vulnerability” (ibid., p.5). In other words, it refers to socially unacceptable circumstances of well-being that are characterised by poverty, unemployment, homelessness, social exclusion and discrimination (Djuve et al., 2015).

### **1.5. Relevance of the study to social work and human rights**

Social work and human rights are highly connected to each other, and within the global definition of social work, principles of human rights alongside with social justice, collective responsibility and respect for diversities are fundamental to the field (IFSW, 2014). As a human being we inherent rights and without them, we cannot live as human beings (Reichert, 2007). It does not matter which nationality we have, where we live, which ethnic origin we have or any other status, it does not affect our entitlement to human rights without discrimination. Human rights entail both rights and obligations. States have the obligatory role as it is under their duties to protect and fulfil human rights in such way that individuals and groups are being protected against human rights violations (United Nations, n.d.). Furthermore, social work purpose has always been to help people reach their “full humanity” (Ife, 2016, p.8). This role puts social workers in a powerful position that enables them to act and promote human rights within the field of social work. Ife (2016) further argues how one might go by and make such a contribution. It is a challenge, but the importance of the potential that social work possess is the ability to shape and influence the conventional legal human rights discourse to fit the ideal humanity and embrace the importance of a relationship that emerges throughout the work. To involve social work and human rights together is to look at human rights as a basis for social work practice (ibid.). Ife (2016) further explains that social worker must nonetheless not accept all aspects of human rights uncritically, “but rather to engage with the difficult challenges of human rights, and to reformulate the idea of human rights so that it is more consistent with progressive social work practice. In doing so, social work can contribute to the human rights field, currently so dominated by the legal profession” (Ife, 2016, p.4).

In this study, the perspective from third sector organisations is being brought out. Firstly, by defining the third sector, terminologies such as “civil society, the non-profit sector, voluntary sector, the social economy or possibly social movements are commonly used.” (Vamstad, 2007, p.33). However, the most common definition of the third sector is non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that are not attached to the public sector and mostly based on non-profit approaches. Additionally, the third sector organisations are mostly characterised by voluntary effort and the civil society (Vamstad, 2007). Third sector organisations can also be described as HSOs. HSOs play a vital role in peoples lives when it comes to their well-being (Brodkin, 2010). It is important to note that HSOs work under certain expectations from their recipients of services. They are expected to symbolise the values of caring, responsiveness to human needs, commitment and trust while, representing challenging bureaucracies burden by inexplicable rules and regulations. When it comes to organisational impact on advocacy activity, it highly depends on the field of service and environmental factors such as policies. One might think that HSOs have little or nothing to do with policies and politics and sees them only on the margins of politics since they are unable to set policy terms. However, HSOs play a pivotal role in the process of social policy making, as their work is fundamentally political and therefore, it is important to understand them as a large part of social politics (ibid.).

The third sector and human rights are highly linked as in many cases within a welfare system, social rights are only being provided to the nation-citizens however, non-citizen such as vulnerable EU migrants in most cases only depend on human rights (Karlsson and Vamstad, 2018). Migrants in all situations, both irregular or in the cases of EU migrants where they have the right to enter and seek for a job in other EU countries, they tend to both life and work in the shadows. They are in some cases not aware of their rights and their rights are also denied. Furthermore, they are highly vulnerable to discrimination, exploitation and marginalisation. The third sector has increasingly become more important to the public sector as they have struggled with obligatory duties for citizens and non-citizens. The importance is mainly because the third sector is free to exclude citizenship entitled rights and work according to human rights (ibid.). According to Djuve et al. (2015), the migrants in Scandinavia have no access to the ordinary social services and are, therefore, very dependent on third sector organisations assistance.

To summarise, the relevance of the topic of this study to social work and human rights are highly connected. Third sector organisations as described here above, perform and work under the definition of social work, and moreover, their main working tools, particularly with the migrant population, are human rights. Other rights, such as social rights are often not accessible for migrants in a host country, therefore the main working approach becomes through human rights. Later within the theoretical framework of the study, social rights will be further discussed in relation to social citizenship. In the following chapter, the structure of the study will be outlined.

## **1.6. Structure of the study**

This paper is divided up into seven chapters. The first part provides background knowledge on EU migration and the vulnerable EU migrants. It also describes the situation of the migrants in both Gothenburg and Copenhagen and ends with brief discussion on the Roma minority. The purpose of the chapter is for the reader to develop a better understanding of the migrants and the migration process. The second part entails previous literature on vulnerable

EU migrants in Sweden and Denmark. EU policies and regulations in addition to Roma inclusion strategies will also be included in the literature review. The theoretical framework of the study will be discussed in the third part of the paper, where the theory of social citizenship will be explained alongside with social rights. The concept of social exclusion and discrimination will additionally be defined in relation to vulnerable EU migrants. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a comprehensive overview of the whole paper and helps the reader to follow through on the research questions and answers. The fourth part of the paper is about the research design and methods where ethical considerations and limitations to the study will also be included. The fifth part of the study are the findings from Gothenburg and Copenhagen, the sixth part includes the analysis of the findings in connection to the theoretical framework and the literature review of this paper, and the seventh part includes conclusion, summary of the study and recommendation for further research.

## 2. Background

This chapter is a background discussion on migration within EU and the vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden and Denmark. The chapter also touches on the Roma minority as many of Roma, mainly from Romania have migrated to Scandinavia (Djuve et al., 2015).

### 2.1. Migration within EU

Kolb (2010) states that it depends on the perspective, how migration can be understood. From an economic perspective migration to welfare states can be seen as a contribution to the economic field of a society. At the same time migration can also be viewed as having a more negative impact as the welfare states can experience lack of capacity to provide services to the citizens. The tax-financed benefits have especially been seen as a magnet for migrants as certain immigration groups are receiving more benefits than they have contributed to the state. Due to this, welfare states have become more restrictive and self-oriented towards these groups of immigrants to reduce the magnet and the economic burden they cause. Regarding that, Berg and Spehar (2012) noted that the first few years after the first EU enlargement, all Member States, except for the UK, Ireland and Sweden made a temporary restriction to immigration where access to the labour market was not offered. In the second enlargement, when Romania and Bulgaria joined the EU, UK and Ireland implemented transition rules, making Sweden the only state within the Union keeping the labour market entirely open.

The increased European transnational migration from Central and Eastern Europe to Northern and Western Europe, particularly Scandinavian welfare states, has led to high level of poverty, unemployment and homelessness of the EU migrants (Amundson, 2017). Gerdes and Wadensjö (2013) have pointed out that Scandinavian countries are the most attractive destination point for poor migrants, not only within EU but also globally. Furthermore, regarding the attraction to Scandinavia, these countries possess one of the highest living standards in the world, therefore, have become a popular choice for migrants who are seeking a better life. The desirable migrants within EU borders have been limited to skilled workers. The migration from Eastern European Member States has been labelled as managed migration as they are characterised as an undesirable group due to their economic and political unstable background that has much to do with their countries economic and social condition (Menz and Caviedes, 2010).

Migrants from the new Member States are often characterised by both lower income and socio-economic status compared to the population of the host country. The struggle the migrants from Eastern Europe face is both in relation to the social welfare system and the labour market as well as other barriers such as non-recognition, discrimination in addition to hate crimes against an ethnic group such as Roma (Amundson, 2017). How EU citizens that migrate to other Member States become vulnerable and homeless has much to do with EU policies and regulations. According to Mostowska (2014), there are numerous reasons why vulnerable EU migrants choose not travel back to their home countries when they are unemployed and struggling in Scandinavia. The main reason might have to do with the fact that when returning, the home country is not obligated or responsible for guaranteeing that person a stable living condition. As a result, they rather choose to stay, and many of them become homeless and rely on homeless services often provided by civil society organisations, and this has become a pattern of an established circle where migrants get trapped.

Migration has in many cases created social problems and according to Goldin et al. (2011), how native residents in the host country treat migrants depends on how much migration becomes a social issue. When migrants experience social marginalisation, it often creates a form of an ethnic minority that follows with a lower socioeconomic position in the society. The result of such marginalisation received from the host country is social exclusion where migrants lack opportunities to reach acceptable living standard due to discrimination (ibid.). In the following subchapters, the situation of the vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden and Denmark are examined in detail.

## **2.2. Vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden/Gothenburg**

In the past few years, Sweden has experienced increased migration from the other EU Member States. The reasons behind this are diverse as many of the migrants are pushed by difficult social and economic situations in their home countries and, the expectation of job and easy living conditions in Sweden (Engblom & Troncota, 2015). However, according to Engblom & Troncota (2015), the situation often gets worse when they reach Sweden. Many of them have reported that it is hard to find a job in Sweden and, a potential reasons for that is many of the migrants have low or even no form of education, some are undocumented, and many of them are homeless. Their daily life is often based on begging, collecting bottles, selling street papers and doing domestic work. Aside which many are homeless, sleeping outdoors, in cars, tents and caravans. Most of the individuals living in such a situation in Sweden are Roma making them feel exposed and greatly vulnerable among migrants in Sweden (ibid.).

In 1999 Roma got official status as a national minority in Sweden. With the recognition of Roma as a national minority, they have more rights to influence on national level issues that concern them. However, the overall view of Roma's situation in Sweden after they became a national minority has not shown drastic changes. They still live under severe vulnerable circumstances and are highly exposed to all relevant social respects. The reason behind the minimum partakes in the democratic process can be due to the framework of Swedish cultural forum as the Roma have few opportunities to participate and express their culture (DO, 2005). In 2011 the European Council asked all Member States to develop national Roma inclusion strategies (Fésüs et al., 2012). In 2012, the Swedish Government signed a long-term policy agreement with the mission of social inclusion of Roma. It is a 20 years long strategy from 2012-2032 that is seen as strengthening the politics of minorities in Sweden. The strategy plan applies to the Roma who have a permanent residency in Sweden and is based on the human rights with an emphasis on non-discrimination and social inclusion to the Swedish society (Länsstyrelsen Stockholm, 2017).

When it comes to Gothenburg, the city has since 2006 experienced increased migration of vulnerable EU migrants. According to uncertain figures, the number of people living on the streets of Gothenburg has increased from 10 to 100 between 2006-2012. However, Gothenburg city has stated that the exact number of vulnerable EU migrants is hard to identify as the mobility of the migrants makes it hard to maintain stable figures (Göteborg Stad, 2016). Since 2013, the city of Gothenburg has collaborated with organisations that offer support to the migrants who live under socially and economic exposed situations. The city along with other municipalities within Gothenburg region assess that there are opportunities present to solve the urgent need for housing in cooperation with NGOs. However, the main financial

support is providing financial resources for the migrants to return to their countries of origin (ibid.).

According to Gothenburg municipality action plan for economic and socially excluded EU migrants (Göteborg Stad, 2016), a fundamental responsibility is to provide for those who are living in urgent need in the city resources of help to support their needs. It is also emphasised that the municipality is obligated to guide a person in need to find the way to provided help and services in the city. There are more importantly no requirements of a person being registered at the municipality to have the right to receive assistance. However, those who are not registered can only receive help that is limited to emergency assistance. If there are children within the household, it will increase the social services responsibility to decrease the families' state of emergency. The right to health care applies to emergency cases, which means if the patient's health condition can wait until he is back in his home country the case is not considered an emergency. According to the action plan of Gothenburg city, many of EU migrants do not have the European health insurance card and have therefore no access to subsidised care in Sweden (ibid.).

### **2.3. Vulnerable EU migrants in Denmark/Copenhagen**

Like in Sweden, it is difficult to estimate how many homeless foreigners are in Copenhagen or in all Denmark. The official numbers are only based on reports from organisations that provide social assistance to this group and not all homeless foreigners do contact these organisations. The number moreover depends on the season because the number increases during the summer, as there are increased possibilities for earning money by collecting bottles during that time. According to documents of one organisation from 2013-2016, 64% of their service users were EU citizens, and 52% of them were from Romania (Kastanje and Hoff, 2017).

In Denmark, homeless migrants are being categorised into two different groups, 'homeless migrant workers' and 'particularly vulnerable homeless migrants'. The first category appears to be 80% of all homeless migrants in Copenhagen, and the majority comes from EU Member States. This category can, however, be divided into two groups, one who includes homeless migrant workers who migrate due to unemployment and poverty in their home countries in hopes for higher salaries in Copenhagen. The second group of homeless migrant workers comprises of seasonal workers, beggars and bottles collectors. Their migration is also due to unemployment and poverty in their home countries, but their intention is not to stay in Denmark for a long-term work, but rather come for seasons and then travel back home or to other places. The latter category is approximately 20% of all homeless migrants in Copenhagen and majority of them are men that also come from other EU Member States. The vulnerability of this group is not only caused by poverty and unemployment, other social and personal issues such as mental illness and addiction problems, are influencing their vulnerable position (Fonden project UDENFOR Foundation, 2012)

The access to social assistance for the unregistered homeless foreigners in Denmark is highly limited, and they are not entitled to any form of economic assistance from the State. In few cases they assist with buying a ticket home, emergency shelters are only opened during winter months, and access to public health care is only in emergency cases. Drug abuse among East European migrants in Copenhagen is a growing problem and since 2012 more than 500 individuals have been registered in so-called 'drug-intake' room (dk. stofindtagelsesrum)



(Mændenes Hjem, n.d.a). It was first provided by an organisation that offers social and health assistance for foreigners that are homeless, drug abusers or in some other way socially excluded from the mainstream society (Mændenes Hjem, n.d.b). The Copenhagen Municipality has seen the necessity for such service and opened a 'drug-intake' room in 2016, which is run and financed by Copenhagen municipality (Københavns Kommune, 2015). To get recovery treatment from the state is possible, however, in many cases, it is on conditional terms where the migrants are offered withdrawal medication if there is a possibility of that person being transferred to similar abuse treatment in the home country (Kastanje and Hoff, 2017). Another form of support from Copenhagen municipality is a program called 'transitprogram', which has operated in collaboration with voluntary organisations since 2016. The target group of the program are particularly excluded migrants, both homeless migrants workers and particularly vulnerable homeless migrants that are not linked to the job market and with extensive social problems. The cooperation of Copenhagen municipality and the organisations comprises of economic support. Thus, voluntary organisations that work with this particular group of migrants can apply for funds through the transitprogram (Københavns Kommune, n.d.).

Danish authorities have made very harsh legislative changes to reduce entry of poor migrants by criminalising begging. Additionally, harsh police strategies have been made towards homeless migrants sleeping outside and public funds for NGOs, who are the leading service providers for the homeless migrants, have decreased and become very limited. The interesting part of the begging ban is that the native drug users seem to be able to sit at one place and beg in peace, which suggests the ban being applied discriminatively (Djuve et al., 2015). Amundson (2017) notes that by criminalising begging it becomes a violation of fundamental human rights, as it is not the key to solving the problem of homelessness.

According to Djuve et al. (2015), many of the EU migrants who migrate to Scandinavia, particularly Sweden and Norway are Roma that come from Romania. Historical poverty is a deep-rooted issue to the social structure of Romanian society. How Scandinavia can offer help in the matter is very limited and has even appeared to be inadequate. It has become a heated political matter in Scandinavia alongside with racism and hatred towards Roma through social media and comments section of Internet sites. The following chapter will provide a brief description of Roma within Europe.

## 2.4. Roma

One major population that can be identified as vulnerable EU migrants, are the Roma (Göteborg Stad, 2016; Kastanje and Hoff, 2017). They have also been identified as the most discriminated minority group within Europe (Fésüs et al., 2012). The reality of many Roma families, particularly within Romania does not leave them with any other option of earning an income than to migrate (Djuve et al., 2015). Roma is a minority group that has been known in Europe for thousands of years. Approximately 10-12 million Roma live in Europe, which makes them the largest ethnic minority group within the EU (Karlsson et al., 2013). The largest Roma population can be found from Romania (Rughinis, 2010) aside which significant Roma minorities also exist in Bulgaria, Hungary, Serbia and Montenegro and Slovakia. From 1990 there have appeared several impoverished Roma communities that to a great extent have been excluded from the mainstream society (ibid.). From historical context according to Zamfir (2013), Roma, have been characterised with a state of chronic poverty, and having no chance to reach a collective prosperity. Not only have they experienced being on the margin

when it comes to economic activities in the society, but their lifestyle is also identified by little social value and high level of social exclusion.

### 3. Literature review

This chapter will provide a review of previous studies that have focused on the vulnerable EU migrant population in Sweden and Denmark. The literature search showed several studies that have been performed, and target vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden and Denmark. However, they are quite limited, especially when it comes to the service providers' perspective. The studies within Denmark have focused primarily on Copenhagen and the situation is similar in the Swedish context as Stockholm's standpoint is dominant. Therefore the focus in this chapter will not exclusively be from the municipality level but also inclusive of the national level. Before focusing on Sweden and Denmark separately, a study from a Scandinavian perspective, which refers to both countries, will be reviewed. Information from this study has been mentioned in the background of this paper, as it includes many essential facts on the matter. At the end of this chapter, EU policies and regulations, which focus on migration will be included as well as subsequent strategies for working with the Roma population.

Djuve et al. (2015) report is the first quantitative study performed on vulnerable EU migrants from Romania, a population that is hard to reach, particularly for a research. The respondents were 1,269 migrants who gave detailed information about their living condition at home, their coping strategies of homelessness in Scandinavia, reasoning for migrating and also, their expectations for the future. The respondents had either migrated to Copenhagen, Stockholm or Oslo. The methodology of the study was mixed methods, as three large surveys were conducted in each city, supported by the utilisation of qualitative methods, interviews and fieldwork, in all three cities and Romania. Many important features were looked at to provide holistic results, including ethnic identity, cultural attitudes, socio-economic background, education, employment and living conditions both in Romania and Scandinavia.

When it comes to the vulnerability of the migrants, in relation to exploitation for casual work, it differs from each city. Those who migrate to Stockholm are particularly vulnerable as they face extreme poverty with the lowest rate of schooling and literacy, in addition to being highly depended on the family or a relationship-based network to survive. In Copenhagen, the dependence on the family network is much less due to extensive resources that are validated by the society. On the other hand, the migrants are more vulnerable to alcohol and drug abuse which has a connection to criminality. In Oslo, the situation is somewhere in-between Stockholm and Copenhagen. Discrimination was one of the factors that were researched, and among the discriminatory behaviour they have received in all three cities, comprised of refused entry to stores, physical violence (mostly from Scandinavian citizens), people stealing money from their begging cups, people spitting on them, and being told to leave public spaces. In both Stockholm and Oslo, where more Roma tend to migrate compared to Copenhagen, they are more likely than non-Roma to be denied access to public spaces such as supermarkets and cafés (ibid.).

Other results of the study (Djuve et al. 2015) that are in relation to the content of this study are NGOs and the civil society as they are essential factor, for migration. Also, mobility from poor countries, such as Romania, to Scandinavia, is primarily motivated by income opportunities. The migration process, therefore, becomes an economic strategy even though it means being homeless and begging to make a living (ibid.).

In the following chapters, the focus will be pointed at vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden, to begin with, followed by a chapter focusing on this migrant population in Denmark.

### 3.1. Previous studies from Sweden/Gothenburg

According to Berg and Spehar (2013), political parties have a significant role when it comes to immigration and policy actions despite the fact that many other actors, such as NGOs and the civil society are heavily involved in the matter. In their research, Sweden was studied due to its support to increase labour mobility both within and outside Europe, which is in contrast to most other EU countries. From a broader perspective, migration policy changes in Sweden have emerged despite the support. The focus on human and social rights perspective has decreased, and a shift has been made from migrants basic needs and embracing multicultural society towards economic features. Unwanted migrants and refugees are said to be a burden to the welfare state, and labour migrants are seen as contributors to the economy, therefore, categorised as wanted migrants. Moreover, Berg and Spehar (2013) conclude that the new labour migration law in 2008 had its consequences, as control was lacking, and exploitation of foreign workers was increasing. Below Spehar et al. (2017) have studied at what governance level the responsibility lies when it comes to vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden. That might further indicate whether the focus is still on supporting free labour and human and social rights or if the importance of economy weighs more, to the extent where migrants' rights have shifted somewhere else.

In 2015 Spehar et al. (2017) looked into failing multilevel governance and vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden. They carried out semi-structured expert interviews with 22 representatives of organisations involved with service provision to vulnerable EU migrants on a local and national level. Their focus was on Stockholm and Gothenburg as EU migrants consider both cities a popular destination. Their main goal of the study was to see if the challenging integration policy of EU migrants reflects a multilevel setting, as there is in forehand, little evidence of multilevel governance. Their main findings showed that policymakers at all levels lack the political will to perform policy solutions and instead shift the responsibility on to the next actor. Local policymakers are waiting for the actions to be made on a national level, while the national policymakers have considered the issue to be a local or regional matter. The EU has stated that the issue is a national concern. Thus, a multilevel governance process has lacked all will from all stages of the political spectrum. The local level is the only level that has acted on the issue. However, these actions have mainly been characterised by emergency actions and short-term solutions in collaboration with local NGOs (ibid.).

To further deliberate on long and short-term solutions Spehar et al. (2017) results interestingly pointed out, that due to Sweden not imposing any transitional rules at the time of both enlargements 2004 and 2007, the country has therefore had even more time than other Member States to come up with and develop policies that provide long-term solutions for vulnerable EU migrants. Their data, on the other hand, showed that Swedish authorities have been hesitant when it comes to these types of policy changes and formulations. As Spehar et al. (2017) note, intra-EU mobile citizens do not fall under the same group as other immigrants due to both their legal status as EU citizens and their formal rights. Nonetheless, they often are being treated similarly to other immigrants as the countries already have immigration policies and services that they provide for immigrants, despite the fact that the non-EU migrants' needs do not apply to the needs of other immigrants.

Ciulinaru (2017) study, examined Swedish local authorities approach on the situation of migrants from Romania who live under severe vulnerable circumstances from a universal rights protection standpoint. As was mentioned above, Sweden's welfare system reputation

comprises of inclusion and a rights protected system, and are also considered reducing measures of homeless migrants. Sweden, therefore, becomes an interesting state to study on this specific topic. Ciulinaru (2017) notes that a ‘creation’ of “internal outsiders” (p.243) is mainly through exclusion from fundamental rights, as national law enforcement plays a vital role for entitled rights. The results of Ciulinaru (2017) research showed that authorities of receiving countries of unwanted migrants, particularly Roma, do not provide legitimacy that is needed to respect and protect human rights. The outlook on the situation might be so that the migrants are not worthy of their time and effort as they are seen as a hindrance for the receiving society. In Sweden the exclusion of the migrant’s rights are not only linked to the legal aspect of the welfare system, it moreover has to do with the moral values of the society as it seems to be morally wrong to include these people (ibid).

Ciulinaru (2017) study confirms the findings of Djuve et al. (2015) regarding discriminatory behaviour from natives Swedes towards vulnerable EU migrants. The participants’ responses were very similar to Djuve et al. results, and Ciulinaru (2017) argues that such reactions are highly likely toward a social group that is vulnerable, stereotyped and lacks competence. Additionally, Ciulinaru (2017) findings showed that the debate of homeless migrants considers mostly the discourse on migration rather than rights. Swedish authorities have mainly been focusing on reducing the flow of homeless migrants, however, when it comes to implementation of human rights, both local and national authorities do not take that into consideration, as human rights enforcement is seen as a pull factor for the migrants.

Karlsson and Vamstad (2018) research explore CSOs part in reducing poverty in Sweden and different interventions the CSOs have for different groups. As they note, poverty is not defined easily because poverty can mean different things to different people. Within Western and Northern Europe with one of the most generous welfare states, you find an increased problem of poverty, where new types of poverty are emerging and challenging the welfare systems. Examples of these new types of poor groups are vulnerable EU migrants, and CSOs have become a significant part of service provision to those groups in cooperation with the public sector. The reason for CSOs establishment as a fundamental actor in social services is due to CSOs providing services with human rights, not on the basis of social citizenship and social rights<sup>2</sup>. In Sweden where the track record has been a universal welfare state and right-based measures, many influences have made the welfare structure based on the citizen’s social rights. Thus, CSOs have taken part in social matters with emphasis on human rights (ibid.).

An overall conclusion to Karlssons and Vamstad (2018) study is that a state that comprises of a welfare system and is expected to provide support to social needs heavily relies on CSOs. It highlights the importance of CSOs and the role they play when tackling poverty in Sweden. Moreover, their findings show “the growing divide between people in poverty who are citizens and those who are not” (p.9). It means that the poor citizens are relying on social rights for support to help them get out of poverty while, the non-citizens such as vulnerable EU citizens are solely relying on human rights where they are only being supported with the most urgent and basic needs, such as food. Moreover, according to Karlssons and Vamstads (2018) results, vulnerable EU citizens have become the second largest group in Sweden who are living in poverty, and as a consequence to that, human rights have become a more crucial tool in work against poverty in Sweden.

---

<sup>2</sup> Social citizenship and social rights will be further explained in the chapter of theoretical framework

### 3.2. Previous studies from Denmark/Copenhagen

Mostowska (2014) performed a study on homeless EU migrants in Copenhagen and Dublin with a focus on the contradiction of the legal situation the migrants face when accessing services. She studied how official policies are realised in everyday practice and what strategies have been framed for helping the homeless EU migrants in each city. In 2012 Mostowska conducted eight interviews in each city with representatives of organisations that support homeless EU migrants. The interviews with respondents in Copenhagen showed similar results as the study performed in Stockholm and Gothenburg mentioned above by Spehar et al. (2017). The responsibility of the state or even the EU is described as the “‘somebody else’s problem’ approach” by Mostowska (2014, p.31). Other results of the study revealed that Danish authorities are very reluctant to provide funding and even offer shelters for those who do not have a social security number. As a result, the staff of the organisations working with EU migrants have undertaken informal ways to help certain migrants, and they base “their justification turn towards humanitarian grounds” (ibid., p.31).

In relation to the research conducted by Mostowska (2014), Jørgensen and Thomsen (2013) made a comparative study on integration policy frameworks in Denmark in the 1970s and the 2000s. The results showed that during 1960 and 1970s Denmark did not have official integration policies in place but developed strategies over time, which then existed into the 2000s. Nonetheless, many of the mistakes in the 1970s have also been present in 2000s, which according to Jørgensen and Thomsen (2013), indicates similar policy processes over different historical periods. The enlargements have made the main difference between these two periods, as the requirement of tighter regulation has appeared (ibid).

Jørgensen and Thomsen (2013) furthermore compared the policy changes and what effect it has had on the policy transformation before, during and after the crisis in the early 1970s and 2008. The pattern of changes was similar in both periods. Before the crisis in the 1970s, a multicultural level was said to have positive effects, low or non-skilled workers had value, labour market position was seen in a way that they were taking jobs nobody else wanted, and language skills were given little attention to as it was assumed the migrant workers would leave again. Housing problems were pointed towards employers to solve and regarding the migrants' positions it was articulated that as long as the economy is good they could stay. During and after the crisis, however, these things started to change. The cultural aspect increased with stereotyping the migrants as dirty, thieves and sometimes lazy. Low or non-skilled workers were seen as a problem and they were said stealing jobs from the native workers. Language skills attitude changed to them not having the capacity or the need to learn, housing problems were now huge and caused by the migrants and finally, when it came to their position as migrants, the attitude was so that they should be sent home (ibid).

Similar results are from the crisis in 2008, however, there are some differences. From the cultural aspect, the stereotyping to some degree has continued after the crisis in the 1970s as Eastern Europeans were labelled as criminals. During and after the crisis in 2008 the stereotyping only increased. Language improvements have drastically changed in the 2000s, Danish language courses have been introduced, and during and after the crisis in 2008 even more focus was set on integration regarding language. The final difference that can be outlined is the housing situation. Not only did housing problems increase during and after the crisis, but homelessness among Eastern European migrants also became an increasing problem (Jørgensen and Thomsen, 2013).

Ravnbøl (2015), a PhD student in anthropology at Copenhagen University performed ten months ethnographic fieldwork with 120 Romanian Roma that live on the streets of Copenhagen and Malmö. The focus was on the experience that the Roma had in maintaining their homes in Romania, creating a safe home on the streets, alongside with job searching, collecting bottles and begging. The main focus was however towards how the migrants perceived and understood EU law and regulations about free movement and human rights, as well as how social authorities in Denmark deal with this group of migrants.

One of the barriers the migrants faced in Copenhagen and Malmö is discrimination, poverty and limited access to rights. These aspects are not primarily within their life in Copenhagen and Malmö, it is furthermore part of their daily life at home. The situation of the migrants was characterised by poverty, to the extent that in Romania they could not afford daily meals and winter clothes for their children. Therefore, the maintenance of the home in Romania is through migration where they live on the streets to save up money. Many of the migrants have a realistic perception of their employment opportunities in Scandinavia. They know the odds are not in their favour when it comes to finding a job. If they do, it often involves a job without a legal contract, and lower salaries than a native citizen earns (ibid.).

In Denmark according to Ravnbøl (2015), a social security number plays a fundamental role in integration. Many employers do not offer a job to those who do not have the number, and the same goes for landlords, as they do not rent out apartments to those without a social security number. Thus, the migrants find themselves in a circle of social exclusion as on paper they may have all the rights to apply for a job through their EU citizenship, however, in practice, they are locked in an exclusive system that is hard to break through. Ravnbøl (2015) further explains that the Roma were aware of their rights as EU citizens but afraid to have and accept a job without a contract. Therefore, the social exclusion is continuously strengthened (ibid.).

### 3.3. EU migration policies and regulations

According to Kolb (2010), immigration policies have gone through a fundamental change in many OECD<sup>3</sup> states, and Menz (2010a) furthermore notes that European migration policies have and are changing quickly. Before, the questions during debates about migration mainly dealt with, whether or not immigration should be allowed. Now it has shifted to the discussion regarding what kind of movement should be allowed. That includes, who should be allowed to become a new member and how the process of admission should be organised. As was noted above the debates have been competing for high skilled migrants and at the same time restricting the access for medium or low-skilled workers. The employment situation of the new Member State citizens before their country joined the EU was characterised by low skilled-low paid jobs (ibid.). Even after EU enlargement in 2007, Recchi and Triandafyllidou (2010) note that the situation for the Romanians, Bulgarians, and Poles has remained the same, and has not shown any improvements as their status on the labour market remains low.

In article 15 of the EU Charter of fundamental rights, it is stated that along with the freedom of movement there is a freedom of seeking a job within the EU. Article 34 says EU citizens residing legally are entitled to social security benefits under EU law, and national law and practices. Article 34 further states that to fight social exclusion and poverty, social and

---

<sup>3</sup> Countries that have signed the Convention of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, n.d.).

housing assistance is recognised and respected by the Union. However, it also indicates that rules are according to Union law and national laws and practices as well (European Union, 2012). Bruzelius et al. (2016) noted, in their study about social rights of EU migrant citizens that in 2010, a EU social security regulation came into force. These regulations established that an employed person would not only be entitled to social security but it would apply for unemployment benefits as well, and it would be based on the national social security benefits system. As it has been listed here, social security benefits sound like universal rights that are entitled to all EU citizens without conditions. However, EU citizens are required to prove their right to reside and by proving it means that they either need to be employed or self-employed, have financial resources for themselves and their family with health insurance or be a student with health insurance. In other words, the requirements are not to become a burden to the host country and are therefore highly dependent on the citizen's economic status (ibid.).

In contrast to the EU charter article 34 and the fight against social exclusion and poverty (European Union, 2012), Djuve et al. (2015) bring up the concept of free movement of poverty. The free flow of poverty refers to EU citizens who migrate to beg, collect bottles and at the same time live in severe, vulnerable circumstances. While the EU framework embraces the freedom of movement and free movement of labour it has limited attention to EU regulation of free movement of poverty. Concerning the Scandinavian welfare states and free movement of poverty from the new Member States in Eastern Europe, it has created a political dilemma. The response framed within policy has gone to the extreme of banning specific activities that many of the migrants do to survive. A ban on begging and rough sleeping has made the provision of NGOs basic emergency services more difficult and Djuve et al. (2015) argue that the EU context of free movement appears to be idealistic and unachievable. In regards to the free movement of poverty Ciulinaru (2017), refers to the situation as an undesired aspect of the free movement policy. In some EU countries, drastic measures have been made to reduce the free movement of poverty, which has caused significant controversy. One of those measures is begging ban but also sending back unwanted Eastern European migrants, which has been highly questioned from a human rights standpoint (ibid.).

Geddes and Scholten (2016) state that international migration and immigration policies can sometimes be explained as “economic inequality and conflict” (p.4). By that, they mean the immigration policies are being implemented in a retrospect that effects the results of policies and provides more conflicts and inequality than solutions. Another crucial factor to mention here are the decision makers when it comes to law and policies. Geddes and Scholten (2016) note that the decisions are mostly coming from the national authorities but emphasise the importance of EU increased partake considering its EU promoting the free movement.

### **3.3.1. Roma strategies within EU**

“Since 1989, the European Union (EU) has played a critical role in advocating for Roma rights, funding Roma initiatives, and incentivising national governments to develop clear policies for the protection of Roma within their borders. While there is room for improvement, the EU has slowly, but surely been moving toward the establishment of a common EU framework for Roma integration that will offer better protection against anti-gypsyism as well as a clearer and more cohesive mechanism for Roma inclusion in European societies” (Pusca, 2012, p.1).



First, however, the situation was different as the EU referred to the 'Roma problem' in Eastern Europe, which comprised of discrimination, as a heritage from the former Communist regime. Furthermore, it was deemed an Eastern European countries problem to fix while the Western EU Members States freed themselves from all responsibility. From the beginning of the EU accession process, the thought of East European migrants, particularly Roma, being welcomed in Western Europe was not the case. Nonetheless, when the new wave of Eastern European and Roma migration became established, EU acknowledgement of the migration and recognition of necessary Roma policy within the EU appeared (ibid.). According to Pusca (2012), the results of various funds targeting Roma inclusive development are questionable. Even though there are investments, both in the form of money and policies, a comprehensive strategy is still missing. An increased social exclusive action is being pushed towards the Roma in the form of "forced evacuations and expulsions, destruction of Roma camps, and rising signs of violence against the Roma communities across the EU" (Pusca, 2012, p.3). The need to address Roma inclusion on a national level is vital as EU policies and frameworks have not shown enough developments on the matter (ibid.).

According to Spirova and Budd (2008), the measurements of poverty and unemployment of Roma in four Central and Eastern European countries, Hungary, Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Romania suggest that the majority are living in poverty. The statistics were income based poverty rates and expenditure-based poverty rates. The numbers showed that Romania and Bulgaria had the most significant gap within both measures, as the difference between the incomes based poverty rates of Romanian Roma and the majority was 47% and 41% according to the expenditure-based poverty rate. The numbers within Bulgaria are similar to Romania but even lower. The smallest gap in both measurements was in Hungary, where income-based poverty rates appear to be 3%, and expenditure-based poverty rate only reached 1%. The conclusion of Spirova and Budd (2008) findings, on EU accession and minority policy, on before mentioned countries, suggest that EU accession appears to have had a good influence when it comes to decreasing the gap between Roma and the population majority. Nevertheless, the data implies that Roma are still experiencing worse living conditions than the majority, particularly in Romania and Bulgaria, and further attention and support from the EU is fundamental for further improvements (ibid.).

"The EU's Europe 2020 strategy for a new growth path-smart, sustainable and inclusive growth-leaves no room for the persistent economic and social marginalisation of what constitutes Europe's largest minority." (European Commission, 2012, p.183). Active dialogue with the Roma is necessary at both national and EU level. The process of reaching social and economic integration of Roma is primarily the responsibility of the public authorities. However, it is furthermore a challenge of changing mindsets, which is about the majority population and all members of Roma communities. Within the framework, it is highly necessary to emphasise that Roma are entitled to all fundamental rights as EU citizens on both national and EU level. This is in reference to non-discriminatory behaviour towards them, as well as the importance of breaking the poverty cycle that keeps moving from one generation to the next. To reach improvements of Roma inclusion, the focus on Roma in integration policies on a local, national and regional level is essential to work against poverty and social exclusion (European Commission, 2012).

## 4. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this research is utilised as a guideline to increase an understanding of the research goals and questions. The framework of this study is based on the perception of social exclusion and discrimination through social citizenship with an emphasis on the EU. Social citizenship has a theoretical approach to social issues like exclusion and discrimination and from theoretical aspects, it can and should be the instrument to work against social problems. In following chapters, these three concepts in addition to social rights will be outlined to give a deeper understanding of the situation of vulnerable EU migrants. The chapter starts with a discussion on social citizenship and social rights, then social exclusion and ends with discrimination.

### 4.1. Social citizenship

The welfare state is closely linked to the notion of citizenship (Bussemaker, 1999a) and the idea of citizenship is implemented through social rights, not the legal system. Thus, social policy of a welfare state is closely linked to the notion of citizenship (Lund, 2002). Marshall's (1964) analytical view on social citizenship is one of the main contributors to the concept. According to him the meaning of social citizenship entails that the citizens have the right to social and economic welfare. They have the right to live according to civilised standards that are dominant in a particular society, which he described as social heritage. Marshall furthermore, claimed that social citizenship provided inclusion to all members of a society, including the poorest and the most marginalised (Dywer, 2010). Bussemaker (1999b) has pointed out that through growing forms of welfare systems and international institutions, such as the EU, social rights of citizens, both within the nation-state and within the EU, have been highly discussed and formulated. Marshall's theory of citizenship has resurfaced and been rediscovered (ibid.).

Marshall, according to Sheppard (2006), sought to promote social stability through social citizenship as a crucial aspect of fighting social exclusion. From his point of view, social rights were a combination of citizenship and social inclusion and people, therefore, would be treated as equal members of society. "Social citizenship is of particular importance because it is concerned with the welfare of people as citizens. Marshall distinguished social from civil rights by arguing that the former involve them as receptors of services, which respond to their needs. The latter, on the other hand, involves the use of power with the potential to create political, organisational forms, which include groups, associations and movements" (Sheppard, 2006, p.22). Marshall moreover understood citizenship as a way of treating everyone equal and as an equal member of society. However, in modern industrial societies, the access to the market trumps equality and as a result production of inequalities and creation of divisiveness has emerged (ibid.).

Marshall's perspective on citizenship has however been criticised. Mullard (1999) has attempted to look beyond Marshall's definition of citizenship. He notes that the concept of citizenship has to be seen as human rights that are un-negotiable at any time. Moreover, citizenship should provide integration and inclusion at all stages in the society regardless of peoples' status, such as income, ethnicity or gender. Mullard (1999) also argues that human rights are problematic as they are often being abused within nation-state borders. Therefore, to decrease the barriers to citizenship, the emphasis needs to be put on social rights by combining civil liberties and human rights.

These criticisms are highly linked to Lister's (2003) feminist perspective on citizenship. Lister's emphasised different entitlements of social rights between men and women, in addition to other socially disadvantaged groups such as migrants. Lister's explorative thoughts have focused on the exclusion of social rights and citizenship. Her concepts excluded from without and excluded from within have shed light on the matter as the former concept refers to individuals outside nation-state. They are then excluded on the base of classification such as age, gender, or ethnicity. The latter applies to individuals within a nation-state who nevertheless, are excluded from social rights (ibid.).

According to Bussemaker (1999a), Marshall has only focused on the public sector of the concept and not the private. Thus, his emphasis is on the state and labour market but leaves out the role of the family, which mainly is referred to unpaid care work. When it comes to migration and citizenship the situation is quite similar to Marshall's ideas on the matter and challenges the question of entitlement. Since Marshall's ideas are very welfare and labour market-oriented, other marginalised groups, such as migrants and the homeless, do not fall under the citizenship framework of Marshall theory and they "become a permanent underclass of citizens excluded from meaningful social participation." (Bussemaker, 1999a, p.4).

Recchi and Triandafyllidou (2010) have pointed out that recent studies have shown that migrants view their countries' accession to the EU positively, but at the same time it has also developed confusion when it comes to their legal status. This confusion is in relation to the belief that many Romanians and Bulgarians think that by becoming European citizens frees them from the obligations of obtaining a stay permit. Furthermore, the legal status has not translated into legal jobs, and the citizenship right still dominates the labour market. Instead of seeing EU citizens as mobile people they are being converted to migrants. Many of the new Member State citizens have seen EU citizenship only as an instrumental tool that secures their stay in another country but not as an identity (ibid.).

#### 4.1.1. Social rights

Social rights have been described as the essences of social citizenship. Marshall's aspect on social rights within social citizenship is the right to economic welfare and security, and the right to civilised life in accordance to standards in particular society (Dwyer, 2010). Dwyer (2010) discussions on social rights are very similar to Marshall's ideas as he notes that social rights help provide a quality of welfare and define citizens' entitlement to social rights. Karlsson and Vamstad (2018) argue that social rights are the rights people have to social services and benefits and are highly connected to social heritage, which is in line with Marshall's ideology of social citizenship.

Social rights are fundamental rights within human rights. ICCPR and ICESCR is the core access for a person to enjoy their social rights and regarding social rights within the EU, all of the European countries have ratified both conventions (Beucitizen, 2015). According to a report published by Beucitizen (2015), there was made a comparative study on the social rights of EU migrants' citizens in eight countries. EU citizenship became an established concept and fundamental element of EU in 1992 by the Maastricht Treaty. The concept became even more established with the Lisbon Treaty and the EU Charter of Fundamental Right in 2009 (ibid.). In the article 34(2-3) of the EU Charter, it is stated clearly what the social rights of EU entail "Everyone residing and moving legally within the European Union

is entitled to social security benefits and social advantages in accordance with Union law and national laws and practices.” (European Union, 2012).

When it comes to welfare regimes, it appears, however, not to have a significant impact on EU migrant citizens accessing social rights. In reality, it depends on residency, which registration requirements apply and more importantly individual Member States have the preference to implement rules that result in limitation of EU migrant citizens to claim their rights (Beucitizen, 2015). In light of this, the authors of the report of Beucitizen (2015) moreover claim that access to social rights and the social condition of vulnerable EU migrants is mostly lacking and one might doubt if there is an improvement of social rights within Europe due to EU citizenship.

Based on the regulations of free movement and non-discrimination, two new regulations have come into force in 2010 where “EU citizens also have access to special non-contributory social security benefits based on the same condition as nationals, if they are habitually resident in a Member State.” (Beucitizen, 2015, p.7). However, as noted above and further mentioned in the report, uncertainties of social rights within the EU remain. Most of the countries set up barriers and especially Sweden and Denmark. They have set up great barriers for EU migrants to access the same social rights as the national citizens, with strict registration rules and proving of residency (ibid.).

Staub-Bernasconi (2007) discusses the neglected rights of human rights being economic and social rights. They are often referred to as second level rights being below civil and political rights. Through the years there have been debates about economic and social rights whether or not they should have a legal status. Current situation of economic and social rights in Europe appears to be weak. Staub-Bernasconi (2007) notes that the Member States of EU must ratify the European Convention on Human Rights but at the same time are not obligated to give assurances on the European Social Charter. Perhaps the most interesting part of neglected economic and social rights is within the Eastern European countries that formerly were a part of the Soviet Union. Before the fall of communism in 1989, economic and social rights were equally as worthy as civil and political rights. After the fall, the chance of embracing and integrating social rights even more did not become a reality. The fact is that no former Soviet Union country has included economic and social rights into its constitution (ibid.).

Social rights have been a controversial matter as to who is entitled to social rights and whether it is the state responsibility of providing such rights. Others have however argued it, being an international institutions responsibility or even within the civil society. Marshall’s ideas were bound to nation state when it came to social rights, and since then, according to Karlsson and Vamstad (2018), no other feasible alternatives have appeared.

## **4.2. Social exclusion/inclusion**

As mentioned above, social citizenship has been a theoretical tool that is fundamental to social inclusion. For a better understanding of the concept, this chapter will distinguish what social exclusion and inclusion contain, with a focus on marginalised groups as vulnerable EU migrants.

“Social exclusion is a complex and multi-dimensional process. It involves the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal

relationship and activities, available to the majority of people in a society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole.” (Levitas et al., 2007, p.25). Furthermore, social exclusion is a comprehensive concept, and the term describes the extent of civic, social and economic part of integration. Social exclusion is also a concept that focuses on the process rather than the outcome (Lund, 2002).

Social exclusion can also be related to specific areas as many excluded communities are on the margins of a particular society. Poverty is furthermore a major factor and deep-rooted in the cause of social exclusion. Thus, a poor community of ethnic minority and on the margins of its society create a combination of factors that cause social exclusion (Backwith, 2015). “To recognize different forms of poverty, such as absolute poverty, relative poverty or social exclusion, as a limitation to and a neglect of the future is vital for academic and political approaches to poverty” (Gaisbauer and Sedmak, 2014, p.3). Therefore it becomes highly relevant to distinguish the main differences in these terms. Gaisbauer and Sedmak, (2014) argue that absolute poverty is a global term and a condition where people live under circumstances of human rights violations as they lack basic goods. Relative poverty or social exclusion can be understood as an income below the risk level of the poverty threshold, with long-term unemployment and poor financial living condition, people are unable to cover the cost of basic needs of the social living standard (ibid.).

Lister (2004) notes that through growing globalisation, poverty has become a social phenomenon and a global social challenge. The concept has to be put into context, and that brings out the relativity of poverty. Relative poverty is a way of understanding poverty in context with a social, cultural and historical nexus (ibid.). Alcock (2006) further notes that the causes of poverty can be declared from two general perspectives. The pathological aspect, where poverty is caused by people’s characteristics, and structural perspective is when poverty lie in the forces of politics and socio-economic structure. Law (2012) describes discrimination, educational patterns, employment and housing locations being structural factors for ethnic minorities and a central problem when it comes to social exclusion. When discussing poverty from a structural point of view, Backwith (2015) brings up questions about people’s behaviour and how it is an important factor of structural poverty. He explains the danger of implying that poor people are victims of circumstances, as they have no choice to change their lives. The dangerous part of this implication, according to Backwith (2015), is because the focus should be more on people’s capacity to be active agents in their lives by acting on their life situation to change it for the better.

Regarding people being active agents of their lives, Gaisbauer and Sedmak (2014) argue that the most vulnerable people when it comes to social exclusion remain invisible and it is due to this that the future of social policies and planning becomes a significant challenge. Their argument regarding invisibility of people living under severe poor circumstances is being trapped in a cycle of poor future. The people Gaisbauer and Sedmak (2014) categorised, as the most vulnerable are: migrant beggars, homeless people, and undocumented refugees and asylum seekers. They note that these people are excluded from social policies, and it is not a minor flaw in the political arena as it has been created by statistical means. They call the invisible factor a “second-order methodological neglect of relevant futures” (Gaisbauer and Sedmak, 2014, p.1)

The solution to the invisible factor is the acknowledgement of invisibility. The EU has described a goal they want to accomplish by the year 2020, which entails defining the range

of poverty within Europe. The strategy aims to reduce the number of people affected by poverty and social exclusion by 20 million. However, people living under circumstances of extreme poverty, such as migrant beggars in European cities, are not included in the future project, and the strategy requires a methodological change (Gaisbauer and Sedmak, 2014).

According to Halfmann (1998), modern societies do not provide social inclusion to individuals. They instead offer inclusion in the form of membership in a social system. The membership of modern society, however, starts from exclusion and from there on, if applicable, inclusion is offered. People who do not have an address, are not able to send their children to school, or those who do not have a social security number are not included in the social system because they do not fulfil specific requirements. The risks of exclusion are, according to Halfmann (1998), often in migration cases. To tackle the threat of migrants' exclusion, institutions need to use the instrument of social inclusion. The results have not shown an inclusive social system of migrants, and the difficulty of social inclusion within the EU is perhaps a result of the original meaning of nation-state as it implicated "inclusion in one nation-state meant exclusion from all other states" (Halfmann, 1998, p.519).

The notion of citizenship in relation to social exclusion is, according to Sheppard (2006), connected to the value and identity of individuals, groups or community. Furthermore, those on the exclusive side of the mainstream society are those who suffer from poverty and unemployment, and it is often associated with other disadvantages such as ethnicity. The material issues and economic inequality of citizenship according to Sheppard (2006), is highly related to prejudice and stigma of particular groups. It can have negative effects on groups when it comes to life opportunities, sense of identity, and results in enhanced low self-esteem. On that note, the following chapter about discrimination will go deeper into the negative effects these disadvantaged groups face on a daily basis.

### 4.3. Discrimination

The purpose of this chapter is to distinguish the concept of discrimination in general and in relation to vulnerable EU migrants. The description of discrimination here below includes prejudice and stereotyping as they are highly linked and are said to lie at the root of discrimination (Ramiah and Hewstone, 2013).

"While prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination are closely linked and often coexist in the individual expressing social bias, social psychologists treat each as a distinct construct with unique properties. Prejudice has been characterized as an individual-level attitude toward, or evaluation of, a group, stereotypes as beliefs about the characteristics and traits of a group, and discrimination as behaviour that favours one's group and intentionally or inadvertently harms another group. "All three forms of social bias share in common that they sharpen group identities and intergroup differentiation and can lead to preservation of the status quo, particularly when shown by dominant group members." (Ramiah and Hewstone, 2013, p.2).

Discrimination is an environmental concept in the sense of its association with normative and socio-structural features. By features, Ramiah and Hewstone (2013) refer to segregated neighbourhoods or areas where discrimination by the majority segregates them from the minority in a geographical way. Also to the extent where the rejection leads to social

hierarchies, decreased social network and increased mental illnesses. One form of discrimination is on the ground of ethnic background, and there is an indication of widespread ethnic discrimination across Europe (Ikram, et al., 2016).

Goldin et al. (2011) have noted that migrants are highly exposed to discrimination, particularly migrants who are poorly educated, have low socio-economic status, only have access to jobs that are at the bottom of the labour market and have no access to legal status within a society. They furthermore note that these circumstances do not only apply to first generation migrants but can develop through coming generations as they also are experiencing discrimination, poverty and social exclusion. Due to this, the host society is posing migrants with tough challenges that are highly likely to result in increased discriminatory positions and risking the chance of social inclusion (ibid.).

Schutter (2016) notes that there are specific groups of people that have become particularly vulnerable to ethnic and racial discrimination across many fields of public life. Among those groups are certain visible minority groups, like Roma that have faced discrimination. Roma minority groups often meet a challenging public service due to their precarious administrative situation. They may experience statelessness as they, in some cases, lack administrative documents to approve their legal status. Because the access to public service is primarily through identity cards, birth certificates and other official documents, their rightful access to public service is often denied. The necessity for decreasing discrimination of Roma, and other groups is increased awareness among authorities, particularly, local authorities as increased flexibility is needed towards legal status requirements for them to be included and integrated into the public system (ibid.).

## 5. Research design and methods

The purpose of this chapter is to describe methods and design of the study. The chapter is divided up into six parts as each part has its purpose of more in-depth description of the methodical part of the study. There are few studies on the chosen topic for this study. With that in mind, this study is built on qualitative research methods in the form of qualitative interviews. The main principle of qualitative research is to develop a greater understanding and perception of particular human behaviour or phenomena (Snape and Spencer, 2003). In studies on homeless and vulnerable migrants, the focus has more often been on the migrant's experience, instead of the service provider's perspective. Their perspective is nonetheless crucial as they can provide an understanding of local social policies, and interaction between the service providers and homeless migrants. Their viewpoint moreover, expands the understanding of a social problem (Clapham, 2003). Concerning that, the methodology of this study is also through hermeneutical perspective with an interpretive approach as it is well suited for researching perception of social actors (Myers, 1997). The hermeneutical perspective will be further discussed in the reflection of methodology, but this chapter starts with the design of the study.

### 5.1. Design of the study

In light of the topic, where the main goal is to bring out perception on particular social experiences, qualitative design as a method is much rather able to bring that out than a quantitative method (Bryman, 2016). Thus, it became an obvious choice to have qualitative design as a method for this study. As noted above the collected data of this study was performed with qualitative interviews. According to Bryman (2016), there are two types of qualitative interview methods, unstructured and semi-structured interviews. Unstructured interviews do not lead the participant in any particular direction, and semi-structured interviews guide the participant to the research topic with a list of questions. As the aim of this research has a specific focus and research questions to be answered semi-structured interviews was considered a suitable technique.

The interviews were conducted by asking open-ended questions. Engel and Schutt (2014) describe open-ended questions so that the participants have their choice of words to answer and they state that when little knowledge exists on the researched topic, those types of questions are commonly used as they provide unlimited responses. All of the interviews in this study were in-person, and according to Engel and Schutt (2014), those types of interviews offer several advantages such as the interviewer has more control of the whole interview and its physical and social circumstances. Additionally, if participants need further clarification, in-person interviews can more efficiently deliver that (ibid.).

The interview guide for the semi-structured interviews was utilised according to Bryman's (2012) approach. The guide<sup>4</sup> was made to cover specific topics, however, the questions were not followed precisely as listed down on paper, as other questions were asked along the way. The structure of the interview guide divided the interviews into seven different themes. The first theme included background knowledge, where the living conditions of vulnerable EU migrants were identified. The first theme also included the work of each organisation and the pattern of the service users residency in both cities, in addition to the organisation's outreach

---

<sup>4</sup> See appendix 4 and 5



work. The second theme covered international work and cooperation of the organisations, the third theme address social exclusion and discrimination work within the organisations. The fourth theme addressed social exclusion and discrimination on a local, national and EU level. The fifth theme addressed responsibility, the sixth theme covered social citizenship both on a local and national level, and the seventh theme was a conclusion on the whole topic.

As the purpose of this study is to compare perspectives of third sector organisations in two different places the design of the study becomes comparative. In the following chapter, the design of this comparative study will be further described.

### **5.1.1. Comparative study**

Comparison in a study is a method design that entails researching two situations with more or less matching methods (Bryman, 2016). In this study the same method was used in Gothenburg and Copenhagen, the only difference was the geographical focal point, as in Gothenburg the focus was on the experience there and the same went for Copenhagen. According to Hennink et al. (2012), a comparative method allows the researcher to further study the topic, as more patterns within the study can be discovered and identified. Comparative studies furthermore, can provide better clarification to a specific topic as different sides to the same issue can come up. Bryman (2016) moreover describes the comparative design as a provision of a better understanding of social phenomena. By that, he means that by comparing two or more issues the meaning of each issue or situations become more holistic in the results.

This study is not only a comparative but moreover, cross-national research as the comparison is between two cities in two different countries. In such comparisons, the goal is often to look for similarities and differences to explain a social reality in a diverse national setting (Bryman, 2016). As mentioned in this paper, the situation of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen appears to be different, despite similarities of both welfare systems. Therefore the goal is to compare these two cities to reflect upon diverse social realities on this particular matter.

### **5.2. Collection of data**

By purposive sampling, Engel and Schutt (2014) note that a sample of research is selected for a specific purpose. When a study is about limited group or resources, potential respondents are limited, and therefore a purposive sampling is well suitable. Bryman (2016) furthermore emphasised purposive sampling in qualitative research when the aim is to collect in-depth answers rather than wide answers. Due to this a purposive sampling was found suitable.

It can be said that the process of the sampling started little less than a year ago through field placement, at Gothenburg municipality. There I got introduced to diverse organisations and actors who work for vulnerable EU migrants in the city. A year later I am performing this research, and while searching for participants, a recruitment strategy had already been established in Gothenburg since previous knowledge of the circumstances existed. Moreover, the confidence level in the sampling process, when it came to having suitable respondents was also high in Gothenburg due to the same reason. This recruitment strategy confirms Hennink et al. (2012) discussion on network strategy as they consider the strategy identification to potential participants through formal network or services. Having participated in a project

within Gothenburg municipality, where formal networking takes place, and having been introduced to organisations that collaborate with the city on certain levels, made the process of accessing suitable sample easier. The sampling process for both cities was mainly through an Internet search and knowing where to look for participants became, due to previous knowledge, easier in Gothenburg than in Copenhagen. Four organisations were contacted in Gothenburg through telephone and email. Three responded willingly to participate, the fourth one never responded.

The recruitment strategy of Copenhagen participants was quite different from Gothenburg as I was not familiar with any organisation targeting vulnerable EU migrants. Nonetheless, I found through Internet search four organisations that seemed to have vulnerable EU migrants as their target group. However, to make sure I had relevant organisations and was not missing any valuable resources out I reached out to a ‘gatekeeper’, a PhD student in Copenhagen who has been researching homeless Roma in Copenhagen and she confirmed my findings. One of the ways in recruitment strategy is ‘gatekeeper’ strategy. Hennink et al. (2012) describe that as a way to get access to important information through a gatekeeper that helps deliver a fitting sample to research. After the gatekeeper’s confirmation, I contacted all of the organisations by email, and all of them answered and were willing to participate except for one, which denied due to a massive overload of work.

Due to the anonymity of the organisations, I have decided to provide a more general description of the organisations and not go into details of each organisation. The organisations’ work with the migrants is diverse, both in the form of short-term and long-term work. The short-term work comprise mostly of services in the form of basic needs, such as food and shelter while the long-term work mainly consist of advocacy and integration work, which includes assisting with job applications and interventional work. In both cities, there is a connection to churches, and there is a specialisation in homelessness and counselling work. Moreover, all of the organisations in each city are collaborating with each other, with local authorities, and are a part of a bigger European network, either with organisations from other countries or are a part of EU organisations.

### **5.2.1. Interview process and participants**

In qualitative research, the number of participants is often small because the focus is primarily on in-depth information and experiences are central (Hennink et al., 2012). The small number of participants in this study also has to do with a short time frame of the research, and a limited number of third sector organisations targeting vulnerable EU migrants. Due to this, a question of information saturation becomes apparent. Hennink et al. (2012) explain saturation as the point during the data collection where the researchers find themselves receiving the same information repeatedly and no new findings are gathered. Constantinou et al. (2017) argue that saturation is the validity in qualitative research and emphasise the importance of the researcher’s reflection and achievement on saturation. From the data, collected in both cities, my impression, considering timeframe and the circumstances of the research, is that enough data has been collected to provide valid results to the research questions. Without implying that more interviews were not necessary, the findings from the interviews to a certain level are repeated information, which provides confidence that enough data has been collected.

As can be identified here above, six interviews were conducted in six different organisations, three in Gothenburg and three in Copenhagen. The interviews were conducted from 8th of March until the 10th of April 2018, and they all took place at the participant’s workplaces.

Before the interviews, all the participants received by email an information sheet<sup>5</sup> that included the purpose and aim of the study. They were also given the notice of their right to deny answering questions, which few of them did. They were told beforehand that the interview would take approximately one hour and all of the interviews were between 45-60 minutes, except for one that was under 45 minutes. All of the participants gave their permission for audio recording, which made the process of transcription easier and made sure no data was left out.

All in all, when it comes to the results, the viewpoints from particular organisations are not the prime focus of the study nor are the organisations the target group of this study. Their perspective is, however, sought after to manifest the standpoint of the third sector organisations, as they are the main actors when it comes to working with vulnerable EU migrants. All of the participants in each organisation work with the target group and meet them on a daily basis except for one. That particular participant works more at a structural level within an organisation that more generally works with all vulnerable migrants and does not limit their work to vulnerable EU migrants. The person's working experience and knowledge on vulnerable EU migrants were nevertheless valuable to the research data.

### 5.2.2. Transcription

The data was prepared for the analysis with transcription. According to Hennink et al. (2012), the transcription depends on the purpose of the research in a way that either the focus is more on what was said instead of how it was told. This research is more focused on what was said, as the method of analysis is content analysis. Hennink et al. further emphasise the importance of identifying speakers in the interviews. Therefore, I have used 'I' meaning interviewer and G1, G2 and G3 meaning respondents from Gothenburg and C1, C2 and C3 meaning respondents from Copenhagen. The transcription process began shortly after the first interview was completed and the advantages of that, as Hennink et al. note, is the possibility of identifying new issues that might come up and work from that in the next interviews. Other advantages when transcribing interviews as soon as they are completed is the identification of saturation as it becomes more easily. All of the interviews were conducted in English except for one, which was in Danish. Often it is suggested that when conducting interviews in different languages a translation of the transcription should be made (Hennink et al., 2012). In this case, translation of that transcription was made in English both to make sense of those findings to the reader, and to preserve the anonymity of that interview.

### 5.3. Method of analysis

The analysis of the data is in the form of content analysis (CA). CA provides direct representation of participants' responses to the research questions and can be identified as a method of descriptive data. CA entails the establishment of categories where each category refers to particular content or theme to bring in the end a holistic understanding of the data (Crowe et al., 2015). Crowe et al. (2015) describe a three-level process of CA, *preparation*, *organising* and *reporting*. The analysis process of this study can be identified with these three levels of CA as the first process refers to the research design and identifying units of analysis and representative sampling. The second level refers to the process of the actual analysis,

---

<sup>5</sup> See appendix 3

coding, identifying categories and themes and the final level is when the findings are being linked to previous knowledge that creates overall results.

The second level of CA, as mentioned above, was performed similarly to Graneheim and Lundman (2004) description. According to them, tools, such as codes, are utilised to perform the analysis, as they are tools to think with and allow the data to be thought out. Creating categories is the core feature of qualitative content analysis. They must be extensive and mutually exclusive, and no data should be excluded or fall between two categories, or fit into more than one category. Categories then can have sub categories and sub-sub categories. When it comes to themes, they are the tools used to link the underlying meaning together in categories and to answer questions as ‘How?’ Themes are considered to be a thread and underlying meaning units, codes or categories. Like categories, themes are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and codes and categories can fit into more than one theme. Moreover, themes can be divided into subthemes (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). During the analytical process of this study, three categories were identified where each of them entails themes, and one theme includes one sub-theme. Below is a table of the categories, themes and subtheme identified during the process. They will be utilised during the findings and the analysis later on in this paper.

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Themes</u>	<u>Sub-themes</u>
Strategies	Approach Improvements	
Authorities	Responsibility Improvements	
EU citizenship	Obstacles	Welfare state

Table 1: Identified categories, themes from qualitative content analysis of transcribed material that comprises of six semi-structured interviews about vulnerable EU migrants, with representatives of third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen.

### 5.3.1. Validity, reliability, and generalizability

According to Bryman (2016), validity and reliability in social research are essential for the evaluations of a study. Golafshani (2003) further states that validity and reliability are concepts all qualitative researchers ought to consider when designing and analysing, as it reflects on the quality of the study. Bryan (2016) describes reliability as a term that measures the consistency of the results of a study, and validity refers to the integrity of the conclusion. Within validity, external and internal factors can be identified. External validity applies to generalizability and generalisation in a qualitative study is to generalise the theory instead of

the population. Internal validity, on the other hand, refers to external and environmental factors of the research process that might affect the results of the study (ibid). This study comprises a small sample and from two cities that do not have same laws and regulations, therefore, the attempt is not to generalise the results. The internal validity was ensured by not influence the participants during the interviews by allowing them to answer questions with minimum interruptions that could have influenced their expressed opinion. Reliability measures whether the study is researching what it says to be researched and has been attained through reflexivity, which means that the research process has been reflective of chosen methodological design (Bryman, 2016). With reflections of research methods in this chapter, it is aimed to attain the reliability and the reflexivity of this study.

## 5.4. Ethical consideration

Ethics are a significant part of social research, and ethical dilemmas are being raised at all stages during the process (Bryman, 2016). Perhaps the most ethical question raised within social research is the purpose of a study. Kvale (1996) states that research on a human matter must have a goal of influencing human welfare and serve in human interest. With that being said, I hope this study fulfils these requirements to some degree and can contribute to the field of vulnerable EU migrants in Scandinavia for possible improvements in living conditions. This chapter discusses the highlighted ethical issues that came up throughout the process of the study. All considered important factors to reflect upon, however, those considerations are not enumerated, as a part of an ethical issue is the individualistic perception, which might vary between people. Bryman (2016) has though listed down ethical principles that can be divided into four parts, harm to the participants, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy and if deception is involved. To start the discussion, informed consent and confidentiality will be further discussed in the following chapter.

### 5.4.1. Informed consent and confidentiality

Along with the information sheet, the participants were given an informed consent to sign to provide secure anonymity of the participants. The consent sheet also included other information about the participant's right, such as, the right to withdraw from the research at any time, even after the interviews have been conducted. Also the right to decline to answer questions without having to give an explanation, agreement on recording the interview, and that the collected data will be handled confidential and destroyed after finishing the paper. The informed consent papers were, however, twofold and the participants chose which one they preferred to sign. The first consent<sup>6</sup> entailed the participant's anonymity, but the name of the organisations could appear in the study, the second consent<sup>7</sup> entailed both the name of the participants and the organisations would be kept anonymous. All, except for two, chose the first consent but since two of the organisations asked for anonymity for both themselves and the organisations, a decision was made to keep all of the participants and their organisations anonymous and refer to the organisations as mentioned above<sup>8</sup>.

Informed consent is a vital part of the ethical consideration in a research. Thus, all researchers must seek participants consent. It depends on the method of the study if the consent is verbal or written (Hennink et al., 2012) but as was mentioned earlier all participants in this research

---

<sup>6</sup> See appendix 1

<sup>7</sup> See appendix 2

<sup>8</sup> See chapter 5.2.2.

gave their consent in a written form. Anonymity and confidentiality are most often a significant part of informed consent. Hennink et al. (2012) note that both terms are often presented as interchangeable but in fact, they are quite distinct. According to them, confidentiality of research information is hard to assure because when presenting findings in a research paper, quotations from interviews are often included. Confidentiality may thus not be ensured indefinite, but the researcher can guarantee that no one will have the authorisation to listen to the recordings or have access to read the transcription of the interviews. Anonymity, on the other hand, ensures that all identifiable information will be removed, therefore at all stages, data collection, analysis and in the written part of a research paper, the participants cannot be identified (ibid.).

All participants in this research were ensured anonymity, and as mentioned above, the participants decided for themselves if the anonymity would apply for them only or the organisations as well. The anonymity of the participants and the organisations when it came to giving out information reported from them in the paper, the organisations were given numbers. They were assigned identification numbers to separate them from each other. It is though important to mention that anonymity is not yet ensured with changed names. Hennink et al. (2012) note that when sharing interesting information from interviews publicly, particularly within a small field, it might make it possible for a person to be identified, or in this case, an organisation could be identified. Therefore, during the process of this study, that aspect was always kept in mind to assure the best possible anonymity of the participants. The confidentiality was ensured to the point where no one else had access or the authorisation to either listen to the recording or read the transcriptions.

#### **5.4.2. Invasion of privacy and deception**

Informed consent is highly linked to invasion of privacy because informed consent does not provide total protection to personal privacy even though it is stated that participants can refuse to answer specific questions. Why participants may choose not to answer particular questions could be due to their personal opinions that they would not want to be revealed (Bryman, 2016). Concerning this, privacy invasion has not been a great ethical concern, as the private life of the participants was not sought after. However, the research process of this study, when it comes to the privacy invasion, might apply to the participants' personal opinion. They are representative of third sector organisations and being asked to answer questions on behalf of the organisations. Nonetheless, some questions were denied to answer because they did not want to bring their personal opinion to the data.

Deception becomes apparent when researchers have presented their study for something else than it is. Deception can also occur when participants have been given information about the research, and afterwards drastic changes have been made that make the information before nonbinding (Bryman, 2016). To avoid any change of deception, the participants were mailed both an information sheet and the interview guide before hand, therefore all information were upfront, and no unrevealed information was brought up. Providing the interview guide beforehand, however, becomes an ethical consideration in itself, and can both be portrayed as beneficial to study or not. It is argued that it was not harming to the study, as in the interviews, the participants who had read the interview guide had well thought out answers, and additional material, which were valuable to the study.

### 5.4.3. Language and interpretation

Language and interpretations in qualitative research raise ethical questions (Bryman, 2016). None of the participants has English as their native language, and therefore, none of the participants answered the questions in their native language, except in the interview that was conducted in Danish. English or Danish is neither a native language of the researcher, therefore, it becomes inevitable to bring that up under ethical considerations. This ethical part of the research process then connects to the interpretations of data, and even though it can be argued that no severe dilemmas appeared it nevertheless, is important to be aware of.

Interpretations of a data are not only linked to native languages, but it is also linked to how words, concepts and particular groups are being interpreted, which also raises an ethical notion. As the target group of this study is described vulnerable, it creates, according to Bryman (2016), a sensitive study. To a certain degree, the sensitivity of the study is being decreased as the target group itself is not being interviewed but sensitive interpretations, however, become evident. Questions are raised toward a group that is beforehand vulnerable within a particular society, and embraces the balance of how within the professional arena the group is portrayed.

## 5.5. Limitations

The study is limited to social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants, meaning, those who have national citizenship of one of the EU Member States and live under vulnerable circumstances are included. Thus, other migrants that are third-country nationals but still migrating within EU borders and are also facing social exclusion and discrimination are excluded. The study also has geographical limitations, as the perspectives from organisations in two cities are included. Moreover, only one aspect is being presented, as the third sector organisations are the only participants in the study. However, as has been mentioned earlier, the third sector organisations are the most important actor for this target group and the only actors in direct contact with the migrants on a daily basis.

The number of interviews in each city might also cause limitations to the study as only three interviews were conducted in each city. However, the third sector organisations targeting vulnerable EU migrants in both cities is not a big field, therefore, the percentage of participating organisations is quite high of the total number. Within Denmark, the majority of the EU migrants are located in Copenhagen. Thus, the work with the migrants is mainly performed there, which indicates that the findings might apply to the whole country. In Sweden however, the situation is quite different as vulnerable EU migrants are not predominantly located in Gothenburg, but also in Stockholm and Malmö. The municipal work with vulnerable EU migrants differs between these three cities, thus, a perspective in Gothenburg cannot be applied to whole Sweden.

The target group was not included as respondents in the study, and mainly due to the purpose of the study. The purpose is to bring out the perspective of actors, working with the target group. Nonetheless, their perspective would have been valuable, thus, might have caused limitations to the study. As has been mentioned before, information sheet, purpose and aims of the study, and the interview guide was given out beforehand to the participants. It could raise questions of limitations, however, it was founded more enhancing the research process. Not all participants did read through the interview guide beforehand, but those who did, had

time to think about the questions and provide more prepared answers that were essential to the findings.

## 5.6. Reflection of methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to reflect upon the method chosen for this study. By utilising the method of qualitative interviews as supposed to quantitative, there is more emphasis on the participants' perspective (Bryman, 2016) and since the aim of this study is to find out different perspectives from different third sector organisations, a method of qualitative research was chosen. A comparative method has its advantages as has been mentioned earlier. It provides a more comprehensive overview of the whole topic, and additional reflections on the same topic are likely to come up. By comparing two different cities in two different countries, making the study cross-national, it widens the social reality even more (Bryman, 2016).

Content analysis was chosen as a method early on, and through the development and design of the study, it became apparent that the method fits well to reach the goals of the study. Other methods were considered along the way, mainly thematic analysis as they to some degree have similar features. However, when all of the data had been conducted, and the analytical process of the study began, some aspects of thematic analysis did not seem fit to the aim of the study. Thematic analysis is a method that describes and interprets the data in a broader meaning from the respondents, while content analysis provides direct description and representations of what was answered to the research questions (Crowe et al. 2015). Thus, a method of content analysis was chosen.

During the analytical process, a hermeneutical perspective has been utilised with an abductive approach. Thorkildsen et al. (2013) argue that with the hermeneutical perspective, the researcher develops an understanding through interpretations of the data, both through the whole data and through single parts of it. Thus, the data is being understood in a circular process. Bryman (2016) furthermore states that interpretations of human action are a centre in hermeneutical perspective as it emphasises the importance of understanding the social actor perspective. The interpretative approach is a significant and a good quality of a hermeneutic mode of analysis (ibid.). When the hermeneutic approach is utilised in a study, it provides information of organisations, and the interpretive part of the analysis develops a whole understanding of the organisations. Furthermore, the interpretations part of the analysis tries to develop a sense of particular phenomena in full context of the provided information in the interviews (Myers, 1997). In light of this, hermeneutical perspective with the interpretive approach is found appropriate analytical approach as the study both aims at social actors perspective and requires the data to be interpreted holistically and not only look at single part separately. Moreover, as Sandberg noted (2000), people's experiences are essential to the interpretative approach, and the meaning of their experience is then made sense of. This is also how the analytical process of this study can be described, as the data comes from workers of organisations where they are asked to answer questions from their perspective, and then it becomes the researcher's job to interpret and make sense of their perception.

Abductive approach, according to Thorskildsen et al. (2013), is about developing new information and explanations based on the background knowledge and theories. Meyer and Lunnay (2013) further note that abductive approach used in a research process brings about the possibility of refining and redevelop a social theory. A deductive approach is also a



common method of qualitative research with content analysis (Crowe, et al., 2015), but creates limitations to theory developments. The part of the data that is not in line with the theoretical framework of the study often gets excluded from the analysis (Meyer and Lunnay, 2013). With an inductive approach, a theory emerges from the data and therefore a theoretical framework is created after the collective data. It can thus be argued that abduction is an approach that combines the two others. Abduction both involves data that does and does not fall under the theoretical framework. However, the information that does not fall under the framework is nevertheless important to the analytical part of the study (Meyer and Lunnay, 2013). This approach was found fitting to the research process as both the theoretical framework was created before the collection of the data, and more data was collected that did not fall under the theoretical framework but were considered crucial addition to reflect on and include.

## 6. Findings

This chapter contains the findings of the study conducted through semi-structured interviews of six, third sector organisations, three in Gothenburg and three in Copenhagen. Through content analysis, three categories were identified from the data, two of the categories include two themes, and one category contains one theme and one sub-theme. All three categories will have a short introduction, and then the themes and the one sub-theme will be discussed independently, where the findings from both Gothenburg and Copenhagen will be compared. The categories identified in the analysis were *strategies*, *authorities* and *EU citizenship*.

### 6.1. Strategies

The first research question asks about how the third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen are working towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants, thus, the first category identified was *strategies*. Under this category, two themes were identified. The aim with the first theme, *approaches*, is to bring out different approaches to the same goal, which is decrease social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants. The second theme, *improvements*, entails improvements of their work, thus, what the organisations expressed as a possible action towards improvement.

#### 6.1.1. Approaches

##### *Long term solutions and stabilisation*

Long-term solutions characterise the approaches of the third sector organisations in Gothenburg when it comes to strategies to tackle social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants. Even though the organisations all provide separately, short-term solutions of basic needs, the focus is primarily on a long-term work. All of the organisations stated that migration from the other EU Member States to Sweden is not temporary. Therefore short-term solutions are not the answer to fight social exclusion and discrimination of this group. All of the Gothenburg organisations expressed that any type of collaboration is essential, and having transnational connections to organisations in the home country was considered vital. As a representative of one organisation stated, “*the living conditions they have here reflects on the poverty and the living condition in the home countries*” (G3). Therefore as all organisations indicated, the development in the home country is equally if not more important than improved circumstances in Gothenburg and Sweden.

The organisations in Copenhagen also work towards long-term solutions but also provide short-term assistance. Two of the organisations (C1 and C2) work with short-term services to get in contact with the target group, for the migrants to get involved in their long-term work. As was mentioned in the background of this paper, the group of vulnerable EU migrants appear to differ from the group in Gothenburg. It is more common that the migrants have other issues apart from living under vulnerable circumstances. These issues mostly comprise of mental illnesses or drug abuse. Thus, the approach, when working with those migrants becomes naturally different and for example, the primary work of one organisation, mainly consists of stabilisations:

“... we have found out that because we are working with the EU migrants now for seven or eight and a half year that if we stabilise them in Copenhagen, then they choose other ways of living then on the streets of big cities in Europe...So

*our approach is that we try to stabilise them here in Copenhagen, so they make long-time solutions instead of short-term solutions” (C1).*

By stabilisation they mean, a place to eat and sleep round-the-clock and access to health care, not only in emergency cases. Their approach, therefore, becomes, *“get out of homelessness, not out of Denmark” (C1)* because if the work is not towards stabilisations, the homeless will never get out of homelessness. Their work has been successful, and the migrants who have participated, have managed to reach the ultimate goal, getting out of homelessness.

#### *Battling poverty, education and rights*

The approach in Gothenburg towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination also involves battling poverty. It furthermore appears to be through economic and social support that often travels back to the home countries. The social support seems to have more of an emphasis on education and other informative ways to developed knowledge, such as awareness of human rights among the migrants. Therefore, a part of the battle against poverty and social exclusion involves the contribution of knowledge in forms of education, and that becomes a crucial factor to an integration of a particular society. As one organisation described it: *“it very much depends on the education, if they cannot read or write it is very difficult for them the settle here and improve their living conditions” (G2)*. Integration work in Gothenburg also depends on the language, therefore, a great emphasis is on language courses from all organisations, as it is the key to access the job market in Sweden.

One of the organisations (G3) in Gothenburg has started, but not yet not fully established, a transnational education project, which is their approach towards development of education, and therefore, increasing social inclusion. Their focus is on Romania where they are creating a common ground between the schooling system in Sweden and Romania, as those two systems beforehand are very diverse. The common ground would then provide a space for mobile children to go to school and pick up where they left off in both countries without being affected by the migration process. Thus, it would then be a foundation for the future integration process.

In Copenhagen, the educational part of the integration was not as apparent as in Gothenburg. In Copenhagen, all organisations pointed though out the migrants’ lack of awareness when it comes to their rights. One organisation (C3) further noted that in a case of unstable conditions of the migrants is it important to fight for their rights, and their work consists of doing their best to give the migrants the same possibilities as goes for the Danish citizens. Another organisation (C2) explained their approaches also consisting of advising and fighting for the migrants’ rights, towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination. That part of their work also contains advice on the registration process, tax registration, step towards getting a job and information about Danish culture. These working methods are all a part of their approach towards long-term solutions.

#### *Lobbying and advocating*

Regarding integration work, the organisations in Gothenburg also pointed out the importance of lobbying and advocate for the rights of this group, as they lack a voice in the society. One organisation (G1) described their work approach when it comes to lobby and advocacy like this:

*“We are an evidence-based organisation, so we collect stories and facts, and we use it both in our conversations with local governments and authorities and*

*also at large in advocacy work, so I think we are an organisation that tries to push at all level, we push locally, regionally and nationally” (G1).*

When it comes to lobbying, another organisation (G2) also describes it in a similar way. Lobbying at EU level is, however, mainly in the form of statistics of the situation in Sweden and with that provides a holistic view for EU authorities. The same approach can be identified at a national level as they are a part of a group where information is being gathered, particularly concerning the exclusion of health care of the migrants, which are utilised to lobby to the politicians.

From all of the interviews in Gothenburg and Copenhagen, it was clear that the organisations' contacts to the local and national authorities have a similar pattern. All of them expressed the value of having a good relation to the authorities. However, in Copenhagen where there is less political will compared to Gothenburg, the organisations explained their approach as careful communications with the authorities. One organisation (C3) in Copenhagen noted that the relevance of chosen words is a crucial factor when speaking to the politicians, and another organisation brought up a similar point:

*“Our experiences is if you tell people (politicians) that they are doing something wrong they don't listen but if we give them good examples of a man who has been living ten years on the streets of Copenhagen and has come out of homelessness is six months that is something they want to know” (C1)*

Thus, in hopes of providing knowledge about what is working, it would be hard for the politicians to ignore that and choose a way that has not been working. The third organisations (C2) expressed that the way of communication with authorities has been towards debates: *“We try as much as possible to engage in debates and invite politicians, and we try to engage with the police as well to have meetings and discussions about the issues that migrants face here” (C2).* In Gothenburg, the main communication issue presented with the municipality was the ability to protest, which was high on one organisation's (G3) agenda. *“Since we are in collaboration with the municipality I have to be careful what I say because it's uncomfortable when I raise the questions on eviction for example, so I cannot protest a lot...” (G3).* Thus, if the protest is towards the municipality it creates hurdles on a local level.

#### *Collaboration with the media and other actors*

In Copenhagen, one organisation (C1) stated that collaboration with the media is an important approach towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination in a sense where a partnership has been created. The organisation expressed their collaboration with the media as an essential factor, and the relationship is built on mutual trust and dependency. However, that is not an overall opinion among the organisations. Another organisation (C2) did not speak about the media in a positive sense, but instead mentioned that they have portrayed a discriminative picture of the migrants, which has affected the general public opinion. In that sense, their approach towards influencing the public opinion on vulnerable EU migrants and decrease discrimination has been through campaigns that focus on the individual within the group of vulnerable EU migrants.

In Gothenburg, a fundamental way to increase inclusion and decrease discrimination has also been through collaboration with different actors. Gothenburg's organisations mentioned collaboration with each other and the municipality, which is characterised by good political will. They emphasised that including other actors, such as the private sector, academia and the civil society, is a part of their working approaches. The media was however only mentioned

as a potential for their improvements. The importance of the private sector involvement and the academia was emphasised by one organisation (G1) in Gothenburg, as their approach has been to increase partnership with these actors. The collaboration with the private sector has mainly been in the form of campaigns and emphasises that in such partnership, the partner has another ear of the authorities and meets other political agents, which can be beneficial to the goal of the campaign. The other two organisations (G2 and G3) both mentioned the gravity of having co-workers that come from the target group. One of the organisations has several colleagues that come from the Roma community, and their perspective is essential for improved circumstances.

In Copenhagen, the organisations that collaborate on a EU level stated that fighting together is better than struggling alone and EU partnerships, therefore, becomes significant. In both cities, the organisations are collaborating with each other. In Gothenburg, even though they provide a different kind of services for the same target group they operate, as one organisation expressed it, *“we try to complement each other as civil society organisations here instead of competing towards the same target group”* (G1). In a connection to that, in both cities, the participation of the civil society is highly valued and perused. In Copenhagen, there seems to be more increased practice in that aspect and the last few years it has become more visible. As music festivals are being held in Copenhagen and towns nearby, vulnerable EU migrants are offered to be a part of it in a way where they are offered a ‘job’ to collect bottles, and all the profit goes to them.

### *Discussion*

In concluding remark, despite the different pattern of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen, the strategies in both cities appear to have the same goal of long-term integration. In both cities, there is assistance towards getting a job, and there is an emphasis on collaboration, both within the cities and within EU. In Gothenburg there is more of an emphasis on language integration and education, both in the form of basic education and inform them about their rights. Moreover, in Gothenburg, the children of EU migrants have the right to go to school. That particular right cannot be found in all municipalities within Sweden, but in collaboration with the Gothenburg municipality, the organisations have accomplished to provide the right to attend school in Gothenburg. In Copenhagen, the focus is more on stabilisations due to the additional issues the migrants are facing besides being homeless and unemployed. Their strategies are more towards the fact that if they are not stable, nothing will change. By ignoring them and the problems they deal with on a daily basis, nothing will change, and through that type of work, the success rates have been very positive. In Copenhagen, the informative strategies are also commonly practised to have an influence on the civil society as a whole, and present the migrants individually and acknowledge their stories. Therefore, aiming towards decreasing discrimination and increasing social inclusion and not generalise them as one group.

### **6.1.2. Improvements**

#### *Collaboration and influence*

The data brought out a different perspective from the organisations on improvements towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg. Increased collaboration, however, with already established partners and creating a new partnership, particularly transnationally with countries that the migrants come from, were dominance in the Gothenburg interviews. One organisation (G2) expressed developing contacts with employment offices and social services in the migrants home countries. Thus, if

a person wishes to go back home, there would exist a specific practice between the states. That would make sure that the person continues working towards the goal of improving their living conditions. Another aspect of transnational collaboration work is to assist the home countries furthermore and share knowledge on rights and integration work.

Another organisation (G1), emphasised investment of already established partnership as strong network contacts and collaboration provide positive results. Awareness of each role in collaborating practice is also crucial:

*“I think if we all coordinate better and if we all talk more frequently, if we would have a greater awareness what each and everyone is doing I think we could also be more effective when it comes to breaking the negative pattern that we do see because of course, we see them and when I say all of us I mean you know, we target sort of four, five entities that are important here, it’s authorities, it’s civil society, it’s academia and it’s the private sector as well and then we have a private individuals so all of these levels sort of some how must come together” (G1).*

Concerning that, the media was one of the mentioned actors, to create a discourse on EU migration in the Swedish context:

*“[c]reate discussions on the matter, give people information, give Swedish society information you know what’s going on in Bulgaria, so people will get a better picture of what is happening and it also you know destroys these kinds of different thoughts about Romanian people, that all Romanians are beggars you know” (G2).*

Similar results appeared in Copenhagen and the identified improvements of the organisations were also quite diverse, yet all expressed the importance of improved collaboration as was mentioned in Gothenburg. However, the emphasis in Copenhagen was though mainly with the authorities. One organisation in Copenhagen (C2) also pointed out improvements of transnational cooperation with organisations in Romania: *“Mainly from the poor part of Romania where the majority would come to Denmark, and try to help them there, to broaden the knowledge, to understand a little bit more, to support them with what they need there” (C2).* On a local level, their improvements are more towards further campaigns with the mission of informing people about the target group and their situation. At their local meeting place, they would also like to take that step more directly in-person, where they have and would like to do more of meeting events. There the migrants are and would meet the Danish citizens and work towards elimination of stereotyping, exclusion and discrimination.

In Copenhagen, one organisation (C1) expressed having more influence is high on their agenda towards improvements. However, to be able to reach that goal the organisation would have to become more prominent, and that is a matter of funding. Improvements could also be made by bringing the knowledge together as the organisation (C1) explained that in Europe there is a lack of consistency with work towards social inclusion and decreasing discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants. In each city, in every country, the ways of working with this group is often very distinctive.

### *Housing*

Improvement of housing was pointed out in both Gothenburg and Copenhagen and as an urgent matter to solve. In Gothenburg, it was pointed out that children have no access to

already existing shelters and that needs to be improved. In Copenhagen, the housing problems were mostly towards creating one unit, which would comprise of accommodation for the migrants and other services they would need. As mentioned earlier, collaboration with EU migrants that have successfully managed to settle down has been established in Gothenburg. The idea that they have brought up as an improvement of the situation has been towards creating a structured plan for the migrants when they get to Gothenburg. One organisation explained it like this:

*“When people migrate here from Romania or Bulgaria, it’s very important to show them that it’s not just like migrating and living here but there must be a plan... some kind of individual plan for everyone so those who will get a place in the shelter it is okay if they sleep there, but you have to make a plan like what it is the purpose of coming? We can maybe give you two weeks or a month to live if you seek for a job then you must attend SFI (Swedish for immigrants), you must go to employment office so that person understands that it’s not just moving and being here because it’s not a solution, we need to activate the people” (G2).*

### *Discussion*

In conclusion, the focus point of the organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen when it comes to improvements in their work was more diverse than similar. However, it can be interpreted that all potential improvements, coming both from Gothenburg and Copenhagen, mostly assimilate to the idea of long-term strategies, where in both cities there is a great emphasis on collaboration with different actors on all levels. The answers from Gothenburg’s organisations were mostly towards increased collaboration, particularly transnationally. Improvements of housing and establishing a practice when the migrants come and seek for help were also considered as a possible improvement. In Copenhagen transnational collaboration was also on the agenda, however, collaboration with local and national authorities was mainly pointed out as a factor that needs to be improved. On EU level the situation of vulnerable EU migrants was described inconsistently throughout the cities in Europe, and by bringing the knowledge together, improvements could be made.

## **6.2. Authorities**

One of the research questions asks about the authorities involvement of social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants, and the second category identified was authorities. Within this category, two themes were identified from the data, which referred to the *responsibility* of the authorities and the *improvements* that can be made by the authorities to decrease social exclusion and discrimination. When speaking about authorities, local and national authorities were mainly discussed. However, EU authorities were also part of the discussion and will be included. It appeared from the data that in both cities authorities play a role when it comes to the organisations' work and has an influence in the work against social exclusion and discrimination of the migrants.

### **6.2.1. Responsibility**

#### *On local, national and EU level*

In Gothenburg, two of the organisations (G1 and G3) expressed their opinion of responsibility towards the battle against social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants

being a multi-level approach. One stated (G1) that to battle social exclusion it is a responsibility on all three levels, local, national and EU level. However, all organisations noted that the responsibility now in Sweden is on a local level, but it should not be that way. Local authorities and NGOs can help to a certain extent, but the issue requires responsibility from national authorities and the EU. One of the organisations (G3) also criticised national authorities in Sweden for placing the responsibility in the hands of NGOs when it comes to defending human rights and battling social exclusion, poverty and discrimination:

*"In Romania for example, there we have Swedish organisations working, they are in very close collaboration with the Government in Sweden, and they often have projects in small villages in Romania, and that is very good, but it's not coordinated and it's not according to the policies of Europe and the inclusion plan for Roma for example [...] but the Swedish government is leaning on them and telling that this is the solution of poverty to give it to NGO forces in Romania and I think that it's quite strange how a government can actually put the human rights and the development and the battling of poverty to NGOs"* (G3).

In Copenhagen, the perception was more towards the EU authorities. Two of the organisations (C2 and C3) stated that the responsibility of decreasing social exclusion and discrimination should be on EU level. One organisation (C2) noted that since EU laws provide to citizens of the Member States the right of free movement, it needs to take a responsibility for the consequences of the free movement. Those consequences have increased the vulnerability of people that are mobile, mainly coming from the new and poorer Member States. Pretending free movement of people who have lower socioeconomic status is either non-existent or temporary thing is not the answer to the problem.

The other organisation (C3) perspective on the responsibility corresponds to the one described above, as it should be a EU responsibility. However, the organisation (C3) adds that it should also be at all three level, only the coordinated legislation should be made from the top that then moves on the national level and from there to the local:

*"I will say that it lies at all three levels, over all it should be at the EU level but by collecting all the regulations and legislations and say that everybody has responsibility, and everybody should contribute and when it comes to the national authorities it should be their responsibility to kind of share it forward to the organisations who work with the target group and in that why I think we all, both in relation to inclusion and also in relation to avoiding social exclusion that we have huge responsibility all of us and that must be taken seriously and happen fast"* (C3).

The third organisations (C1) did not free the EU from the responsibility of social exclusion and discrimination but pointed out that the primary responsibility also lies at national level:

*"It could be at EU level but I also think national we have a big responsibility because if you look at Copenhagen or if we look at Denmark... it's a big win for us to be a part of the EU and I think it should be like if you say yes for something you also say yes if there is a problem...I think we have a big responsibility on national level to stop the discrimination towards EU migrants so instead of talking about all the bad cases, let's talk about what's working*



*and say this is a good business case for Denmark so let's help the people who are socially excluded and need help" (C1).*

As it has become evident here, in both cities the findings showed that there exists a minimum responsibility of national authorities despite the fact that all organisations perceive it differently. They should play a significant role when it comes to responsibility. All of the organisations in Gothenburg mentioned how fighting against social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants differ from one municipality to the next. Since local authorities have the responsibility, the treatment and respect of the vulnerable EU migrants' rights depend on each municipality in Sweden. It is up to each municipality to decide how to tackle the migration of vulnerable EU citizens. The same situation occurs in Copenhagen, as the main responsibility is at local level, but all the organisations agreed on the fact that is should not. However the perception of responsibility is more towards EU level in Copenhagen than in Gothenburg

#### *Differences on the local level*

In Gothenburg it appears, from the organisations, to be good political will when it comes to social inclusion of vulnerable EU migrants. However, in comparison with other big municipalities of Sweden it seems to be different according to the organisations. In Malmö, the municipality has decided not to partake in the matter, and in Stockholm, it is said to be somewhere in between Gothenburg and Malmö. Meaning the political will is not as good as in Gothenburg but is though more than in Malmö. It was mainly due to this that the responsibility was pointed at the national level. National authorities should steer the procedures of social exclusion and discrimination so all municipalities would work comprehensively. Then the rights of EU migrants would not depend on where they live in Sweden. *"It is strange that you have the right to go to school in Gothenburg, but if you move to other cities, then you do not have that right" (G2).* Furthermore, it was expressed by that organisation (G2) that it is difficult for EU to be responsible for something that happens inside national borders, and it should also be a responsibility of national authorities.

About the inconsistency of Swedish municipalities, the perspective on the EU authorities having the responsibility from Copenhagen organisations, simulates to the reason why national authorities in Sweden should have the responsibility. As was brought up by one organisation in Copenhagen:

*"...I think it's difficult on the local level because if we look around Europe every municipality is tackling it differently. I've been around Europe and I have seen places in Germany where one city does this and the next city does that and they are pushing just like that differently [...] and like Spain you know, people are moving from Madrid to Barcelona because there they can get some different help and instead it could be same solutions for the whole EU and for the whole countries within EU" (C1).*

Therefore, an overall strategy to address social exclusion in discrimination not only in Copenhagen or Denmark but all over Europe is missing and, useful results would not appear with local authorities being responsible. As the situation is now, according to the organisations, in Copenhagen, the local authorities and national authorities are fighting over who is going to pay, and with that attitude, it is hard to reach improved circumstances.

## Discussion

The responsibilities of authorities in both cities seem to differ mainly on a local level, but similarities can be identified on a national level. From the findings, it seems to be more political will within Gothenburg municipality, towards both collaborating with the organisations in the city and act on the migrants' rights. They have made it possible for migrants' children to attend school, which shows their engagement. The Gothenburg's organisations also stated the main responsibility being at the local level and even within the third sector in Sweden. However they did not agree on that, and pointed the finger towards national authorities. In Copenhagen it also appears that the responsibility is within the local authorities and highly depended on the third sector. The national authorities show minimum interests in the matter as they also do in Sweden, but the opinion on Copenhagen municipality is different between the organisations. Two of the organisations expressed both the local and the national authorities lacking interested and showing minimum responsibility while one organisation experienced the situation so that local authorities are willing to do more but are being restricted by the national authorities. Majority of the organisations in Copenhagen however implied that the main responsibility should be at the EU level.

### 6.2.2. Improvements

#### *Politics and funds*

In Gothenburg the improvements presented by the organisations comprised mostly of discussions on a national and EU level. All of the organisations mentioned good political will within Gothenburg, but cohesion is missing on a national level. All organisations mentioned that even though political will is good within Gothenburg now, it is not necessarily indication for the future, as politics change regularly. Not only does this apply to politics at a local and national level, but EU is also a political institution and as one organisation pointed out: *“political winds sort of blowing through Europe will also be seen in European Union”* (G1). That organisation also emphasised the importance of funding because it will backlash and become more costly later on if there is none. Therefore, even more, investment financially by authorities on all levels and see the full picture in long-term solutions are emphasised as a path towards improvements and success.

To improve the situation among vulnerable EU migrants in Copenhagen, all of the organisations also raised the question regarding funds. They feel like the funding system is not working as well as it could be. Therefore, two organisations (C1 and C2) suggested a special social fund within EU could be established, and organisations would apply directly there, instead of going through the national board like it is now:

*“Well at this point we are part of some EU funds, where I think they could improve is by not distributing the funds to the national authorities but then give out to the organisations, I think and a lot of voices have been heard on this that it should go straight from EU to the organisations in stead of being handled, I know that Denmark has applied for these funds, they got the funds but something happened for two years and they couldn't be accessed so they were stuck there and then we finally got the funds”* (C2).

The other organisation (C1) pointed out that the situation with vulnerable EU migrants today looks like the situation was with homeless Danish citizens ten years ago. At that time the most prominent problem regarding the homeless Danish citizens was which municipality should pay to help them if they had moved from one city to the next. To solve this, legislative

changes were made where other municipalities could help that particular person and get a refund from the city that the person was from. With European social fund similar issues could be solved transnationally:

*“Our proposal to do it is to make a social fund where you can get a refund, so if you are in Denmark helping Romanian citizens you don’t need to get the money from Romania, you get it from a social fund in EU where all the EU members pay” (C1).*

### *Understanding of EU laws*

In this context, it was underlined by the organisations in Gothenburg that in politics and within EU, social exclusion and discrimination needs to become a priority, otherwise, nothing will change. One organisation (G3) emphasised the importance of this particular priority require actions at all levels. Another organisation (C2) noted that improvements on a local and national level could comprise of a better understanding of EU law and the interpretation part of EU law is lacking. Regarding this, the terminology of the target group was also mentioned as a factor that needs to be improved:

*“[...] From my point of view the people we meet are not migrants, they are citizens of the European Union, so they are citizens and actually because...the terminology would then include more rights and actually they have more right. When we say migrants, it’s excluding the rights and the fact that they are EU citizens so...I mean this is about how society is approaching the legal status of people when you say migrants it’s something temporary, something that you are not responsible of something that you can push from you I think” (G3).*

### *The situation of EU migrants*

The situation of Roma in Sweden was also expressed in Gothenburg, however hardly mentioned in Copenhagen. As has been mentioned before, Roma in Sweden have official minority status, and there exists a social inclusion plan for them, but improvements of that particular plan are needed, as well as an acknowledgement of its existence. Moreover, Roma people migrating from Romania and Bulgaria since the enlargement of 2007 are not included in the inclusion plan, which requires reconsideration of Swedish authorities. Improvements are also needed in general when it comes to discrimination of Roma in Sweden as they still are according to one organisation, treated with severe discrimination.

Even though the situation of Roma was not discussed among the organisations in Copenhagen, all of the organisations pointed out the importance of not seeing all vulnerable EU migrants as one group and instead look at them individually. One organisation (C1) emphasised the importance of this is not only among politicians and journalist, but also by the whole society. Furthermore, the representative of this organisation stated that when it comes to the outlook on the migrants, it is vital for the social system to look at the migrants individually and explained:

*“It’s very important that we put the EU migrants who’s biggest problem is work over to the job sector and the particularly vulnerable in the homeless sector because right now it’s a mitch match, which means that people who have never been homeless and don’t want to be homeless they are put over in the homeless sector and then they start to have homeless behaviour like*

*drinking, drugs stuff...so we have to make two different groups as we do with Danish people” (C1).*

It was further highlighted that there does exist a system for the 98% of the people in Denmark. Therefore, the answer should not be to create a new system but instead include those who fall out of the system. On that note, it was also brought up (C3) the need for the authorities to open the laws and create a space for those who assist vulnerable EU migrants, as the extent of helping them would increase. Concerning that on a EU level, it was also mentioned (C1) that there does exist a system for asylum seekers but not for EU migrants and is something that EU should consider due to the consequences of the free movement that has led to vulnerability of many people all over Europe.

At a local level in Gothenburg, the findings showed similar answers to Copenhagen as one organisation (G2) stated that improvement needs to be made within the social services, to make the interaction between the migrants and the authorities more official so they can be offered better assistance, particularly with legal advice. It is often so that they only get a verbal denial and the lack of official documentation is needed. It was explained this way:

*“If you go to social services or employment office and if you get denied you should require an official paper of denial then you could appeal maybe with the help of lawyers or on your own and in some cases it’s very important because in many cases the person has a right according to the law to at least one month economic support until maybe the person finds a job” (G2).*

#### *Health care and shelters*

All organisations in Gothenburg also mentioned necessary improvements are needed for all vulnerable EU migrants that are excluded from health care and considering that recognition of human rights could be improved significantly. As it was explained: *“their human rights is basically up to voluntary forces, like NGOs” (G3)*, which is a factor all organisations emphasised needed to be improved by bigger and more powerful forces. The municipality of Gothenburg once had contact to local authorities in Romania, however that has not worked out as planned but *“they are trying to develop it again” (G3)*, which would be improvements on a transnational level when it comes to health care and acknowledgement of human rights in general.

In Copenhagen, the organisations also pointed out potential improvements of local services provided by the municipality. The night shelters, run by the city is only open during the winter months, and one organisation (C2) suggested that to improve the situation for the homeless migrants is to open the shelters all year around. Copenhagen municipality has a department that works with vulnerable EU migrants, which all of the organisations expressed was a positive development and a step towards improvements. However, as was described (C2), the services they provide there have mainly been buying tickets and sending them home, *“it’s a little bit cleaning up the streets or something like that” (C2)*. More advanced work in the form of interviews and help to settle if that is the wish of the migrants is needed from the organisations perspective.

All organisations in Copenhagen are a part of the transit-program, which is an interdisciplinary work of the organisations under the auspice of Copenhagen Municipality. Potential development of a transit-house in Copenhagen was discussed among the organisations and expressed to be a great addition to improve circumstances of the migrants and the workers:

*“To make one collected transit-house in Copenhagen where we have everything, doctors, interpreters, place to sleep, where you could stay, a locker to your things, where everything is collected under one roof so when you would come to Copenhagen you could go there and get help with getting a job, apartment, personal number etc. [...] because then we think that we could give them much better assistance than we do today and collect all of the resources together so they won’t have to run around to different offers in Copenhagen which is beforehand hard and difficult to figure out” (C3).*

### *Discussion*

It is fair to conclude, regarding improvements of authorities, that the findings were quite similar within both cities. Both emphasised the need for increased funding from authorities at all levels. Due to lack of cohesion on a national level, particularly in Sweden, and a lack of cohesion within cities in Europe, the organisations, all mentioned improvements in that area. Their opinion on national and EU responsibility has likely much to do with that fact. Copenhagen’s perception regarding improvements concerned also funding and was expressed as being a primary need towards improvements on a local and national level. They have even taken the funding improvements on a EU level and suggested a social fund being created within the EU. Thus, forgo the involvement of national authorities, which has caused much disturbance. In both cities, the improved circumstance was mentioned concerning EU law, while in Gothenburg the improved interpretation was suggested while in Copenhagen legislative changes were recommended to assimilate with EU law.

## **6.3. EU citizenship**

The third and the last category, identified through the data was EU citizenship, as one of the research questions concerns social citizenship of EU. In the interviews, it became apparent that vulnerable EU migrants are facing obstacles when it comes to accessing their rights as EU citizens. Additionally, the organisations are facing obstacles in their work towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of the migrants even though the legal framework of EU citizenship exists. Thus, a theme identified under the category was *obstacles*, and a sub-theme was also identified from the theme, as in most of the cases, those obstacles consist of registration requirements of the Scandinavian welfare systems. This chapter will start with a brief introduction to the theme and from then move towards the subtheme, where the findings of the study will be presented.

### **6.3.1. Obstacles**

Where there can be improvements, there can also be obstacles. In the case of changed circumstances of vulnerable EU migrants towards entitlement of social rights, decreased social exclusion and discrimination, the reality is that there are significant obstacles along the way. Those obstacles mostly concern the structure of the welfare systems that makes it hard for migrants, particularly the vulnerable ones, to register and access the system on EU basis. Therefore, the obstacles that can be acknowledged will be further described through the Swedish and Danish *welfare system* with a focus on the registration requirements that appear to play a significant role when it comes to social exclusion and discrimination.

### 6.3.1.1. Welfare system

#### *The problem with national authorities*

The main obstacles that can be seen from the interviews, when it comes to the entitlement of EU rights of vulnerable EU migrants are the national authorities. In Gothenburg, all organisations expressed that the municipality of Gothenburg is doing what it can, considering the circumstances, which is the Swedish welfare system. One organisation (G1) explained it in a way that Gothenburg city is working uphill in a political sense where national authorities have only provided minimum support. It was also stated (G3) that national authorities take social citizenship of EU much less into consideration than the local authorities in Gothenburg. The national authorities are instead making policy changes and regulations that increase the difficulties of staying in Sweden as a EU citizen.

The organisations in Copenhagen had, amongst themselves different opinion when it comes to local authorities and the consideration of social citizenship of EU. One organisation (C1) expressed a similar opinion as in Gothenburg and stated that Copenhagen municipality is working with it and trying. However, certain things indicate no consideration, but the limitations towards not fully committing to EU law is due to national authorities. The other two organisations (C2 and C3) however, did not think there is any consideration of Copenhagen municipality or of the national authorities when it comes to social citizenship of EU. One organisation (C2) noted that the political agenda in the city has not been positive and created huge obstacles towards social inclusion and in fact been discriminating vulnerable EU migrants.

#### *Legislative changes*

In all interviews in Copenhagen, the legislative changes that have been made in the municipality were brought up. Banning begging on the street and sleeping outdoors in groups were considered by all organisations as significant obstacles. One organisations stated (C2) that the migrants have even been arrested for sleeping alone outside and added: *“it’s like criminalising homelessness [...] and even though it’s not targeted per nationality or for specific group of people the practice has shown that they are targeting the migrants, unfortunately”* (C2). It was furthermore stated by another organisation (C3) that those laws contribute to social exclusion from the top down, which makes it even harder for them, from the bottom up, to work with the target group.

All organisations in Copenhagen moreover stated that these legislative changes had not solved any problems, and only made the migrants move to nearest towns during the night. They then return to Copenhagen during the day, as that is the place where the odds of earning money are the highest. Two organisations (C2 and C3) mentioned another possible legislation changes in Copenhagen municipality: *“It would mean that if you would be arrested in Copenhagen municipality for doing something illegal then you wouldn’t be allowed to be in Copenhagen and you would have to move to other municipalities, I mean that’s completely ridiculous”* (C3). As all Copenhagen organisations pointed out, these laws are not working toward long-term solutions. A perception of one organisation (C1) on these legislative actions might be connected to the welfare system as they stated that politicians think the reason why vulnerable EU migrants are migrating to Denmark is primarily due to the welfare state system, however they disagree: *“They don’t come and say we know the Danish welfare system and we want something! Most of the people I meet they come because they are moving away from something not towards something”* (C1). Nevertheless, Copenhagen municipality and national authorities, according to the organisations, perceive the situation so that if vulnerable EU migrants are being treated as poorly as possible, they will leave. Furthermore, the authorities

think if they begin to treat them well, more will come. All of the organisations, however, agreed on an opposite perspective, as they will not leave if they are poorly treated and not provided help.

The same perception was brought up in Gothenburg but did not have to do with legislative changes such as begging ban or sleeping roughly. It had more to do with the welfare system itself in relation to EU law. One organisation (G2) noted that information about EU laws lacks in Sweden, and within the social services, the migrants have been getting different answers to the question of registration. Furthermore, they explained that as a EU citizen you have the right to register and get a temporary registration to seek for a job, however, in the majority of the cases it does not apply. It has become problematic for social workers which laws to choose, the national law or the EU law when it comes to these registration applications. Here is an example of a Roma family in Gothenburg that has been trying to register to the system:

*“They’ve been working here for several years, but they cannot get a personal number still because according to the Swedish law you must prove that you are here for a year and in that case, you can get a personal number. They have work contract you know for like three months and then six months and the tax office they only count, or start to count when you can prove you will be here for one year and they never count the previous months that you have worked, they never consider that” (G2).*

Regarding that another organisation in Gothenburg stated: *“authorities in Sweden are actually not fulfilling the law of free movement...we are not doing what we are supposed to do” (G3)* and moreover, explained the system trying to keep people out with the requirement of personal number and those conditional reasons to get a personal number. From the perspective of that organisation (G3), the political outlook on EU migration in Sweden is not accurate. It is common that the perception of the motive to migrate to Sweden is due to the attractive welfare system just as in Copenhagen and all the benefits that come with it. The actual reason, in most of the cases, has nothing to do with the welfare system, and it is important to consider that the migrants are moving away from poor circumstances, not towards the welfare state.

The welfare system, when it comes to registration, was also considered by the Copenhagen organisations as an obstacle to inclusion. All organisations mentioned the difficulty of getting a personal number and moreover explained the almost the impossible way to get the yellow card, which is an insurance card that provides health care.

*“The registration process is that you first get a contract then you register with taxes and the state administration that issues that you are now living in Denmark, this is just a confirmation, it’s not a right in itself but after that they (the migrants) need to find a place where they can register the address in order to get the yellow card which has their personal number and that is where a lot of people get stuck because finding a place is very difficult in Copenhagen [...] many rent out rooms without declaring it to the authorities, which means that they don’t want people to register at that address and there is a very high price for the rents so a lot of people don’t have an address in Copenhagen. They work, they have a job, they sleep outside or in shelters because they don’t have an address” (C2).*

### *Discussion*

Regarding EU law, the matter of social citizenship of EU was reflected on and in both cities more obstacles than access is the reality of the EU citizenship of vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden and Denmark. In both cases, the registration part of the welfare system is being the main hindrance to access EU rights. What characterises both findings in Gothenburg and Copenhagen is that all agree on the entitled right of the migrants but also agree on the fact that local and national authorities opinion does not correspond. In Gothenburg, it seems that the municipality is trying, as all three organisations expressed the good political will. However, the municipality also experiences obstacles that come from higher authorities and are the ones making the national law that are a part of the welfare system. In Denmark, there seems to be even less consideration of EU social citizenship both within local authorities in Copenhagen and national authorities. How Copenhagen municipality has reacted on the issue are legislative changes that ban begging and sleeping rough in camps. All organisations agree on those changes being an act of discrimination and social exclusion, and even though officially those changes were not to target vulnerable EU migrants, their perception however differs.



## 7. Analysis

This chapter will contain the analysis of the findings discussed above, in relation to the theoretical framework and earlier literature of this paper. The analysis will be divided up into three parts, and each part entails the analysis of each category identified from the data. The first analysed category will be *strategies*, then *authorities* and finally *EU citizenship*. Within each part, the analysis will include both findings from Gothenburg and Copenhagen in a comparative discussion.

### 7.1. Strategies

#### *Long term solutions and integration*

The strategies in both Gothenburg and Copenhagen of the thirds sector organisations towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants comprise of long term-solutions and integration. That is to a certain extent in line with earlier research regarding policies to tackle social exclusion and discrimination. Those policies are based on the long-term process as both EU framework on Roma inclusion (Pusca, 2012) and reducing poverty in Europe are long-term based (Gaisbeur and Sedmark, 2014). In Gothenburg, the emphasis was more on battling poverty than in Copenhagen, and as was stated by Backwith (2015) poverty is a significant cause of social exclusion, therefore, essential to include the aspects of poverty when discussing social exclusion. Thus, it can be argued that Gothenburg approach, when it comes to strategies, corresponds to EU goal of acknowledging poverty and reduce the number of people affected by poverty. Nevertheless, the EU goal does not apply to vulnerable EU migrants, meaning it only applies to poor people who live in their home countries (Gaisbeur and Sedmark, 2014). Thus, an even great emphasis should be made on battling poverty of that particular group.

An integration process is a strategy that can be found in both cities. Language courses were emphasised in Gothenburg, as it increases the odds of people finding a job. In Copenhagen, there was no mentioning of such courses. It brings up an interesting point as both Mostowska (2014), and Jørgensen and Thomsen (2013) have pointed out in their studies that language knowledge is a big part of Danish integration process. Integration policies, however, are needed for a person to be included to a society. As Halfmann (1998) argued, in a case of migration, the starting point in a new society always begins with exclusion, and from there inclusion can be offered, if relevant. Sheppard (2006) has pointed out that poverty and unemployment are factors, associated with other aspects such as ethnicity that actuate social exclusion. Thus, it can be argued that battling poverty and integration work in the form of language courses is a fundamental way for increase social inclusion.

In Copenhagen, the vulnerability of the EU migrants differs from Gothenburg, as it is more common that the migrants are dealing with additional problems from unemployment, poverty and homelessness. As was discussed in the findings, and as Djuve et al. (2015) have also stated, the migrants are often dealing with mental illnesses and substance abuse, which makes them particularly vulnerable. In that sense, the emphasis on strategies becomes automatically diverse. Thus, in Copenhagen, stabilisation of the migrants is a priority to develop social inclusion. In the context of Marshall's interpretations of social citizenship where everyone is included, the poorest and the marginalised as well, migrants were not included (Dwyer, 2010). Sheppard (2006) has pointed out a different reality of social citizenship, particular within welfare states. His argument comprises of market involvement and in modern industrial society has overshadowed the value of social citizenship. Thus, it can be claimed that

stabilising those who are in a severely unstable condition is the most accurate approach towards the starting point of social inclusion.

### *Collaboration*

In both cities, the approach has also been in the form of campaigns and collaboration with various actors. Collaboration with the media can be found in Copenhagen but only mentioned as a factor that could be improved in Gothenburg. However, it did bring out diverse responses in Copenhagen as on the one hand, the collaboration was said successful by one organisation, but by another, the perception of the media has not been positive and said instead contribute to the problem. Within that organisation the emphasis is more on campaigns for informing the public. Since discrimination, according to Ikram et al. (2016), is an environmental concept, it commonly manifests in particular communities and families and becomes a cycle that moves from one generation to the next. Thus, as Goldin et al. (2010) have also emphasised, public awareness is needed in order to decrease social exclusion and discrimination. Gaisbeur and Sedmark (2014), further distinguish the necessity of visibility of the most vulnerable when it comes to social exclusion and discrimination. By not including them and acknowledging the struggles they face is a form of neglected future. Thus, it can be argued that media involvement and campaigns are valid approaches to inform and educate the public and the private sector, as well as the civil society when it comes to the situation of vulnerable EU migrants. It then increases the possibility of visibility and leads to improvements and change.

Concerning public awareness of the migrants' situation it is also in line with the strategies of the European Commission (2012). According to them, an active dialogue is one response to social exclusion and discrimination and that breaks the poverty cycle, and changes the mindsets of both those who are excluded and are excluding. Lobbying and advocating for the migrants' rights can be identified in both cities and an effective way to reach both public awareness and influence mindsets. According to Beucitizen report (2015), welfare states, particularly Sweden and Denmark, have shaped the system towards great barriers in the form of exclusion for non-citizens. In the interviews, both in Gothenburg and Copenhagen same arguments were pointed out and to make a change the action of lobbying and advocating are being utilised. The emphasis on collaboration with the civil society, among others, can also be identified in both cities and from that it can be argued that by bringing the attention and the discussion to entitlements of social and human rights it would not only be an eye-opening for the migrants, but also for the civil society that then can contribute to the battle of social exclusion and discrimination.

## **7.2. Authorities**

### *Authorities on the local and the national level*

In both cities, the organisations responded quite differently when it came to local, national and EU authorities and their involvement and responsibility. In Gothenburg, it appears that collaboration between local authorities and the third sector organisations is characterised by good political will, however as all three organisations pointed out that does not apply for whole Sweden. The responsibility when it comes to vulnerable EU migrants is on a local level, meaning every municipality in the country has control over how much investment goes to tackle the circumstance of this group. The perception that the organisations in Gothenburg have on responsibility differs from the actual practice. All of the organisations agreed on the fact that the responsibility should not be at the local level, but rather at the national or the EU level, mainly national level, particular due to inconsistency of municipalities in Sweden.

In Copenhagen the answers were similar, however, the municipality of Copenhagen was not described as having as good political will as Gothenburg. The dominant perception is that EU should have the primary responsibility for social exclusion and discrimination. It was highlighted that free movement has had its consequences that EU needs to take responsibility for. It was also pointed out that Copenhagen municipality today has the main responsibility and the same goes for Gothenburg. However, it was stated an overall strategy is missing, not only in Denmark but all Europe and each city is tackling the same issue differently, which decreases the change of having a positive outcome.

Sephar et al. (2017) have described the situation in Sweden similarly, as the responsibility is mainly on a local level, while national and EU authorities lack the political will to partake in the matter. Also when it comes to Swedish national authorities, they have had great amount of time for developing long-term solutions for EU migrants. They are the only EU Member State that did not implement any transition rules after both enlargements, however, have been very hesitant towards such development (ibid.). Earlier literature corresponds to the Danish context as Mostowska (2014) described a shift to the local level, and national authorities being reluctant to show interest in the matter. That also resembles the results from the interviews in Copenhagen as all organisations agreed on the fact that local authorities are the leading actor and national authorities free themselves from all responsibility. According to Ciulinaru (2017), the most important actors of inclusion in society are national authorities. They make the law that goes for the whole country but are not respecting and considering human rights, as they are apprehensive towards the possibility of it being a pull factor for migrants. The findings thus indicate that the reluctant action of national authorities is to decrease migration of 'unwanted' migrants, as Berg and Sephar (2013) described it, instead of working on the matter.

#### *The responsibility of the third sector*

In the findings from Gothenburg, national authorities were criticised for putting the responsibility in the hands of NGOs, when it comes to defending human rights and battling social exclusion, poverty and discrimination. Berg and Sephar (2013) have stated that the focus of national authorities in Sweden, when it comes to vulnerable EU migrants, has moved from social rights to only basic needs. Therefore the civil society has become heavily involved and taken that role. Staub-Bernasconi, (2007) have further mentioned concerning the responsibility of authorities that all EU Member States must ratify the European Convention on Human Rights. However, their obligations towards the European Social Charter to give assurances are not mandatory. Therefore, it can be indicated that due to vague EU restrictions, national authorities get away with not taking responsibility and have chosen to do so. The Roma minority was only mentioned in Gothenburg, which indicates that the majority of vulnerable EU migrants in Copenhagen are not Roma, as was described in the background of the paper. From the findings, it appears that even though Sweden has an official inclusion plan and Roma minority has official status in Sweden, actions on the matter are severely lacking. On EU level, earlier research show similar pattern whereas EU framework of Roma integration is not delivering acceptable results (Pusca, 2012). According to Spirova and Budd (2012), Roma minorities in Romania and Bulgaria are experiencing the least among of improvement when it comes to inclusion and discrimination, and that corresponds with the findings from Gothenburg, as Roma groups from Romania and Bulgaria in Sweden do not fall under the official Roma inclusion plan. Thus, it can be argued that significant changes of responsibility regarding Roma are needed not only on EU level but on the national as well.

### *The participation of EU*

In Copenhagen, the findings also show lack of participation from national authorities, but EU responsibility was more reflected on. The situation of vulnerable EU migrants was indicated as being the consequence of free movement, which the EU is considered responsible for, and therefore needs to acknowledge its repercussions. These findings suggest what both Djuve et al. (2015) and Ciulinaru (2017) define as free movement of poverty and it being EU responsibility. Ciulinaru (2017) moreover describes the free movement of poverty as an undesirable aspect of free movement and Menz (2010b) said it is only including high skilled workers and excluding the rest. Geddes and Scholten (2016) emphasise the responsibility EU has to act on this, as national authorities are those who create migration policies in retrospect, which has been said creating more problems than solutions. It can, therefore, be interpreted that the perception in Copenhagen when it comes to increased partakes of EU authorities, would decrease social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants.

When it comes to improvements, Gothenburg emphasises improvements mostly on the national level. By establishing actions in all Sweden is necessary, and was suggested with increased funding. Additionally, better understanding and interpretation of EU law was stated necessary, to improve the official social services of the migrants, particularly regarding registration. To change the terminology of EU migrant was also considered necessary. The term EU migrant was said rather indicate a deprivation of rights, but the term EU citizen was said rather include their rights. Atkinson (1999) argued that interpretation of EU laws and the entitlement of social rights within EU is vague, as national authorities can interpret the laws to their benefits. Article 34 of the EU Charter can be interpreted under the free movement that EU citizens are entitled to social security benefits in the receiving country, which then falls under Union law. However, article 34 also states that to fight social exclusion and poverty by offering social and housing assistance is under both Union and national law and practices. That indicates that the Member States have the possibility to follow their legislation and free them from responsibility.

In Copenhagen, the improvements for authorities also comprises of funding, both locally, nationally and on a EU level. It was suggested that one social fund within the EU could be created where organisations could apply for funds directly, without going through the national authorities, which both is time consuming and often comes with conditions. Legislative changes were also suggested for improvement, both on a EU level to enable the Member States to collaborate more transnationally, and on a national level to allow the migrants to access the welfare system. In a way, it can be argued that both legislative changes suggested in Copenhagen and better interpretations of EU law suggested in Gothenburg mean the same thing, as according to article 15 and 34 of the EU charter, and therefore EU law, both welfare states can make those changes and include the migrants in the system by considering the Union laws. It was argued in Copenhagen that there does exist a system, thus a new one is not necessary to include everyone. Whether it is on a national level or EU level the findings, correspond to Karlsson and Vamstad (2018) research. Their results suggest that the value of social citizenship within EU does not provide the vulnerable EU migrants with any social rights. The poor national citizens are entitled to social rights, but the poor migrants can only rely on human rights provided by the third sector organisations, which has been difficult as national authorities are lacking in that aspect as well.

### 7.3. EU citizenship

#### *Obstacles due to national authorities*

In Gothenburg, the findings show the obstacles of vulnerable EU migrants entitlement of social citizenship and social rights within the EU is mainly due to national authorities. The city of Gothenburg seems to consider social citizenship of EU as much as possible, but the main obstacles they face to increase their work are national authorities. In Copenhagen, the municipality is not perceived as cooperative as in Gothenburg, but is considered taking social citizenship more into consideration than national authorities. How national authorities perceive EU migration, both in Sweden and in Denmark, is a factor that hinders improved situations as authorities indicate the welfare system being a magnet that attracts poor and vulnerable migrants from the poorer Member States. In both cities, the perspective of the organisations when it comes to migration to Sweden and Denmark has nothing to do with the welfare system. The migrants are not moving towards something, they are moving away from poverty. The perspective of Danish authorities, particularly at national level, is even more discriminatory than in Gothenburg as according to the findings, it is the politicians' opinion that if migrants are treated poorly, they will go and if they are treated well, they will stay. That has, however, in practice of the organisations, showed opposite results. Those findings are in line with earlier research as Geddes (2003) noted that how welfare state perceive migration is not through individual migrants, instead, through generalisations of one group and that affects the whole situation, of entitlement of social rights, social exclusion and discrimination.

#### *Obstacles towards social citizenship of EU*

As has been mentioned through the theoretical framework of this paper, Marshall's idea on social citizenship refers to inclusion to all, equal access to social rights and he has linked welfare states and social citizenship closely together (Marshall, 1964; Sheppard, 2006; Bussemaker, 1999a). The findings of this paper, however, indicates that social citizenship of EU, as Marshall has described it, is hardly entitled to vulnerable EU migrants within the Swedish and Danish welfare system. Their way of handling the issues has more been in the form of obstacles with restricted requirements of entitled social rights. From both cities, the organisations described the obstacles to access the system with personal numbers and addresses. In Sweden the right to personal number is provided if people can prove to the authorities that they will stay in the country for at least one year and provide for themselves. The same goes for Denmark in the sense where the personal number is only granted if that person has an address. Both, earlier literature (Ravnbøl, 2015) and the findings showed that finding legal accommodations is a significant obstacle for people in Copenhagen. When it comes down to it, perhaps the national law weighs more. As mentioned in article 34 of the EU Charter the entitlement of social security are accordance with both Union law and national law (EU, 2012) and those two sets of rules and regulation can differ. In practice, it mainly depends on the national requirements of individual Member State (Beucitiz, 2015).

Despite the fact that the findings in Copenhagen expressed more consideration of the municipality than national authorities when it comes to an entitlement of social citizenship of EU, drastic legislative changes have been made by the city that creates huge obstacles of vulnerable EU migrants. Bans towards begging and sleeping rough in camps were established in 2017. Those actions also indicate Geddes and Scholten (2016) argument that when law and policies concerning migration are being implemented in retrospect, it increases the possibility of inequalities rather than equality. All of the organisations agreed upon these laws only making a hard situation of the migrants worse, which demonstrates the thought process of bad

treatment results in migrants leaving Denmark. Furthermore, the findings indicate that by implementing such law, the problem is not solved, it only moves geographically.

Mullard (1999) has criticised Marshall ideas about social citizenship and said that the emphasis should be on human rights instead of social rights as the questions of entitlement would therefore not be relevant, as human rights are entitled to all human beings. Bussemaker (1999a) also criticised Marshall for not including migrants in his theory of social citizenship. That can be connected to Lister's (2003) feminist perspective on citizenship. She referred to the concept being excluded from within a particular society, which means excluded from social rights, and that can be interpreted through both findings in Gothenburg and Copenhagen. The registration process in both places has played a significant part in social exclusion. From the results, it can also be interpreted that the situation vulnerable migrants face in Gothenburg and Copenhagen are in line with the criticism that Marshall has gotten on the theory of social citizenship. Mullard (1999) notes that there is a lack of human rights emphasis in Marshall's (1964) theory, and as Ciulinaru (2017) further states that authorities are not working towards both respecting and protecting human rights within national borders. All six organisations mentioned the importance of human rights in the situation of vulnerable EU migrants. They noted that human rights are the main formal framework the third sector can utilise, and at the same time is not being taken seriously enough by the authorities. Moreover, as Karlsson and Vamstad have pointed out, within Swedish national borders, vulnerable EU migrants are not being offered social rights, there is only a possibility to work with human rights.

Additionally, as was stated in a report published by Beucitizen (2015), there are uncertainties of social rights within Europe, and it raises the question of improved circumstance due to EU citizenship. In that regard, through the findings of this study, it appears that consideration of the entitlement of social citizenship and social rights is severely lacking and how both national authorities, Swedish and Danish, are considering it seems to be to a minimum extent. However, at a local level there appear to be more consideration, the municipality of Gothenburg seem to consider the social citizenship of EU to a good extent according to the findings, and more than the municipality of Copenhagen. It can though be interpreted that the value of EU social citizenship is not worth much for vulnerable people, and what appears to be written in theory, does not play out fairly in practice.

## 8. Concluding discussion

The circumstances of the migrants in both cities differ to a certain extent. In Gothenburg, it is more common to find Roma people whereas in Copenhagen the majority is non-Roma that have additional problems such as mental illnesses and substance abuse. It is also more likely to find vulnerable EU migrant families and children in Gothenburg, and with that in mind the findings from the interviews, particularly when it comes to strategies, evidently have a different focus. In both cities, the focus is predominantly on long-term solutions. The findings show more emphasis in Gothenburg on language courses and general education as those factors are considered a key to social inclusion. While in Copenhagen the emphasis is more on stabilising the migrants who suffer from additional problems, for them to be able to participate in the society. It is a fair indication of Halfmann's (1998) notion of social exclusion and inclusion, where the starting point in a new society is always exclusion, and from there, if considered applicable, inclusion is being offered. It then appears from the findings that the organisations take that into account. To reach inclusion they all perform preparation work in the context of Swedish and Danish society.

Even though the strategies might appear right, are they also enough? From the findings and the analysis of this study it is evident that still to this day, 11 years from the enlargement of Romania and Bulgaria, where the EU migrants mainly come from to Scandinavia, severe social exclusion and discrimination yet occurs. There is always a room for improvement, and increased collaboration seemed to be the overall conclusion. Not only collaboration with authorities on local, national and EU level, but also other actors such as media, the private sector and the civil society. The awareness of the issue might be the answer to improvements as one might argue if you do not know about particular situation how can you act on it. It is not long ago since EU authorities have taken action to the matter, both with Roma inclusion strategies and now fighting against poverty, which though does not apply to migrants. What is though interesting is that it does not seem to have shown drastic measures of improvements. The EU role when it comes to implementations is mostly to push the Member States to include those strategies and regulations in the national legislation. However, beyond that, the EU appears to have less influence than national authorities. It has also been argued in this study that responsibility should be at the EU and national level because, when local authorities have the responsibility, as they appear to have, there is a lack of coherence between the municipalities. Not only is there a lack of coherence on a national level in Sweden and Denmark, but the situation on a EU level also looks the same as almost every municipality within Europe is handling the situation by themselves, thus differently. Evidently as was pointed out in the interviews fighting together is much better than fighting alone. Thus bringing the knowledge together and expand on collaborations both nationally and within Member States of EU, it expectedly increases the changes of decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants.

In that regard, it can be reasonably concluded that even though strategies of third sector organisations are accurate, they still are limited to the broader picture. It is not always about the will to help, even though that goes a long way. There are other factors such as funding and politics that play a significant role. From the findings and the analysis, it appears that the responsibility is with local authorities, and furthermore with the third sector organisations as well. Certainly, it is not the answer to the long-term solutions that the third sector organisations are fighting for, as they are dealing with limited sources of action. For the first, their framework is through human rights within welfare system that base their primary rights on social rights that are exclusive to migrants. In most cases, at least a part of the

organisations economy comes from authorities. It can either mean, the funding's they get is not enough for influential solutions or, the funding's they receive are on the authorities terms, which limits their 'freedom' to do what they consider necessary. Therefore, the suggestion of social fund within EU could play a significant role towards enabling organisations to be more independent from local and national authorities, and even have more influence in their field.

There is no doubt that from the information given in this paper, collaboration is a major tool that needs to be reconciled. The third sector organisations cannot fight this battle alone, and it appears that neither can local authorities. More powerful resources are required to take action, and particularly in the case of EU migrants that are EU citizens for the first, entitled to EU social rights for the second, cannot be ignored. It is an investment to work against social exclusion and discrimination, and investments are not made on a temporary basis. Neither is the migration of EU citizens to other Member States temporary circumstances, and it can be argued that the longer it takes to invest, the more investments will be needed. Thus, a question to authorities can be: why not act on it as soon as possible?

When it comes down to it, the social citizenship theory and what it entails, as has been discussed earlier in the paper, are social rights to all members of a society where no one is excluded. It can apply to the EU, as the Union has become one large society, where members have EU citizenship and are entitled to certain social rights. For the Member States, it becomes their responsibility to make sure that those rights are being implemented. However, the findings of this study show that within the welfare systems of Sweden and Denmark, the EU citizenship is only being considered to a minimum extent, mainly through the free movement and the right to seek and have a job. It has though been more intended for high-skilled workers. It is apparent that both national authorities of Sweden and Denmark lack severe consideration to EU social citizenship. At the local level, there seems to be more will to work with it, particularly in Gothenburg, but it also seems so that the municipality of Copenhagen has jumped on the inconsiderate train as the legislative changes and their mindset of not treating the migrants well in order from them to leave is prevailing. That mindset is also evident within the national authorities in Denmark and it not only minimises the possibility of EU migrants enjoying their rights but also invalids their citizenship of EU.

With the registration obstacles for vulnerable EU migrants, both welfare systems have created an almost impossible way to access the system, which is the opposite of the ideology with EU citizenship. Of both local authorities in Gothenburg and Copenhagen, and national authorities in Sweden and Denmark, Gothenburg city appears to be most considered towards the social citizenship of EU. One might interpret that as positive, but in a broader sense, the question of *is it enough?* still rises. In that regards, the concept of assimilation can be brought up again. If in the case of Gothenburg, where there is a political will to act on the matter, it has not influenced other municipalities in Sweden to increase their actions. Neither has it made an impact beyond national borders. Perhaps that it is not enough then, perhaps the full step towards acting on the issue is not desirable due to the fear of being too welcoming of more EU migrants as has been described before. Therefore it can be concluded that it is not enough that one municipality shows interest towards important improvements, assimilate all actors on every level to work together would undoubtedly have a major impact on the whole situations. Not only when it comes to social exclusion and discrimination, but also the social citizenship of EU would then possible serve its purposes and be handled according to EU law.



## 8.1. Summary

In light of increased migration within EU borders to Scandinavia, mainly from Central and Eastern European countries, the third sector has taken the leading role of providing services to vulnerable EU migrants, primarily due to a lack of involvement of national and EU authorities. The study aimed to compare from the perspective of third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen, the strategies when it comes to decreasing social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants. The study also aimed to see how authorities are and could play a part from the perception of the organisations. As these two cities belong to similar Scandinavian welfare systems, however, they appear to have different perspective and reputation when it comes to migration. Thus, the aim was furthermore to find out from the organisations perspective how local and national authorities are considering the social citizenship of EU when it comes to vulnerable EU migrants. The study included six participants, three from Gothenburg and three from Copenhagen, who work within third sector organisations and provide service for vulnerable EU migrants. Through the analysis of the research, three categories were identified, strategies, authorities and EU citizenship that helped to provide analytical answers to the research questions. It has become evident that the work of third sector organisations in Gothenburg and Copenhagen with vulnerable EU migrants to decrease social exclusion and discrimination are accurate considering the situation of the migrants. Their approach is long-term actions, fighting for the migrants' rights appears to be high on the agenda and collaboration with various actors as well as, lobbying and advocating for their rights to local, national and EU authorities are apparent. The main differences of the strategies in Gothenburg and Copenhagen have to do with the diversity within the group of vulnerable EU migrants. In Copenhagen it is more common that the migrants are experiencing additional problems apart from poverty and homelessness, such as mental illnesses or substance abuse. In Gothenburg it is more common to find families who have migrated together, and also Roma minorities than in Copenhagen. Due to this, the actual strategies become diverse, however, the overall goal is mainly the same.

In Gothenburg there is more of a political will than in Copenhagen, which is the main influential diversity that can be identified in their work. A lack of political support evidently affects the situation of the third sector organisations. Despite the responsibility being placed in their hands, they lack resources and authority to make drastic changes from the bottom up. The power of change mostly comes from the top down, therefore, collaboration and increase involvement of higher authorities is necessary. The national authorities both in Sweden and Denmark seem to show similar interest, which appears to be minimum. In both cases they seem to 'free' themselves from responsibility, but in fact with their increased involvement, drastic changes could be made, particularly when it comes to assimilate the local actions into one action. The lack of social citizenship consideration appears to be the case on both national levels, and is quite obvious in the obstacles the welfare system creates with the registration process for the vulnerable EU migrants. However at local level, the municipalities seem to consider social citizenship of EU to a more extent, and Gothenburg more than Copenhagen. The city of Copenhagen appears to have gone ways with legislative changes that looking at it from an outside perspective, increases social exclusion and discrimination. Instead of pushing for the migrants' rights and well-being, they are rather being pushed out of Copenhagen or Denmark. That also shows a major difference between the two places when it comes to mindset, particularly on a local level. The results show that within Copenhagen and all Denmark the political opinion is rather towards not treating them well to increase the chances of them migrating back. In Sweden or at least in Gothenburg, it was not vocally expressed in that way but at the same time it was stated that the situations could be handled better. There is

always a possibility to do better and there certainly is a way to improve this study with further research, which will be presented in the following and final chapter of this paper.

## **8.2. Recommendation for further research**

In light of this study for further research, suggestions are several. For the first it is suggested to include more participants as one of the limitations of the study can be pointed at the number of participants. The second suggestion is not only to compare findings from Gothenburg and Copenhagen or any other two cities within the EU that experience migration from the new Member States, but also to compare the perception of the public sector in one particular city with the perception of the third sector in the same city. To further elaborate on the suggestion, the case of this study would then additionally involved the participants who represent the municipalities of Gothenburg and Copenhagen, and furthermore, participants who represent national authorities of Sweden and Denmark. In that sense, the results of the study would have broadened the picture of the socially excluded and discriminated EU migrants. The third suggestion would be towards comparing different municipalities within Sweden and Denmark as the results of this study have shown that it is mainly up to each municipality how things are being handled towards vulnerable EU migrants. The fourth suggestion is in an even broader sense and includes the perception of EU authorities. Lastly, as the study did not focus on integration factors however it got brought up in the findings, for further research, it is also suggested to reflect more upon integration policies and what that means in regards to social exclusion, discrimination and social citizenship.

## Bibliography

- Alcock, P. (2006) *Understanding Poverty* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Amundson, E. (2017) 'European transnational migration and homelessness in Scandinavia', *International Journal of Migration, Health, and Social Care*, **13**(1), p. 26-38. Available at: <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/docview/1906155357?accountid=11162> (accessed March, 2018).
- Atkinson, R. (1999) 'Citizenship and the struggle against social exclusion in the context of welfare state reform', in Bussemaker, J. (ed.), *Citizenship and Welfare State Reform in Europe*, London: Routledge
- Backwith, D. (2015) *Social Work, Poverty and Social Exclusion*, England: Open University Press.
- Berg, L. and Spehar, A. (2013) 'Swimming against the tide: why Sweden supports increased labour mobility within and from outside the EU', *Policy Studies* **34**(2), pp. 142-161. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2013.767585>
- Beucitizen. (2015) *Social Rights of EU Migrant Citizens: A Comparative Perspective*. Available at: [http://beucitizen.eu/wp-content/uploads/Deliverable-6.1\\_final1.pdf](http://beucitizen.eu/wp-content/uploads/Deliverable-6.1_final1.pdf) (accessed February, 2018).
- Brännström L., Giritli-Nygren, K., Lidén, G. and Nyhlén J. (2018) 'Lived Experiences of Changing Integration Policies: Immigrant Narratives of Institutional Support and Labour Market Inclusion/Exclusion in Sweden', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, **8**(1), pp. 25-34. DOI: 10.1515/njmr-2018-0009
- Brodkin, E. Z. (2010) 'Human Service Organizations and the Politics of Practice', in Hasenfeld, Y. (ed.), *Human Service as Complex Organizations*, London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bruzelius, C. Chase, E. and Seeleib-Kaiser, M. (2016) 'Social Rights of EU Migrant Citizens: Britain and Germany Compared', *Social Policy and Society* **15**(3), pp. 403-416. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746415000585>
- Bryman, A. (2012) *Social Research Methods. 4th Edition*, Oxford: Oxford University
- Bryman, A. (2016) *Social Resarch Methods. 5th Edition*, Oxford: Oxford University
- Bussemaker, J. (1999a) 'Introduction. The challenges of citizenship in late twentieth-century societies', in Bussemaker, J. (ed.), *Citizenship and Welfare State Reform in Europe*, London: Routledge
- Bussemaker, J. (1999b) 'Citizenship and changes in life-courses in post-industrial welfare states', in Bussemaker, J. (ed.), *Citizenship and Welfare State Reform in Europe*, London: Routledge.

- Ciulinaru, D. (2017) 'The justification of harsh treatment of homeless Romanian migrants in Sweden', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 7(4), pp. 243-250. DOI: 10.1515/njmr-2017-0031
- Clapham, D. (2003) 'Pathways approaches to homelessness research', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 13, pp. 119-27 DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1002/casp.717>
- Constantinou, C.S., Georgiou, M. and Perdikogianni, M. (2017) 'A comparative method for themes saturation (COMeTS) in qualitative interviews' *Qualitative Research*, 17(5), pp. 571-588. DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1177/1468794116686650>
- Crowe, M. Inder, M. and Porter, R. (2015) 'Conducting qualitative research in mental health: Thematic and content analyses', *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 49(7), pp. 616-623. DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1177/0004867415582053>
- Djuve, A. B., Friberg, J.H., Tyldum G. and Zhang, H. (2015). *When poverty meets affluence: Migrants from Romania on the streets of the Scandinavian capitals*. Available at: <https://www.rockwoolfonden.dk/app/uploads/2016/02/When-poverty-meets-Affluence-WEB-VERSION.pdf> (accessed January, 2018).
- DO. (2005) *Discrimination against Romanies in Sweden - a report on the DO project in the years of 2002 and 2003 in counteracting and forestalling ethnic discrimination against Romanies*. Available at: <http://www.do.se/contentassets/43dd39b0ad754345bad500f1b7a34193/rapport-discrimination-romanies-sweden.pdf> (accessed February, 2018).
- Dwyer, P. (2010) *Understanding Social Citizenship: Themes and perspectives for policy and practice 2<sup>nd</sup> ed*, Great Britain: The Policy Press.
- Engblom, H. & Troncota, M. (2015) *Romania and Sweden need to keep trying to find a solution for the Roma beggars*. Available at: <https://futurelabeurope.eu/2015/09/04/romania-and-sweden-need-to-keep-trying-to-find-a-solution-for-the-roma-beggars/> (accessed March, 2018).
- Engel, R. J. and Schutt, R. K. (2014) *Fundamentals of Social Work Research 2<sup>nd</sup> ed*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- European Commission (2012) Appendix 1: An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, in Pusca, A. (ed.), *Eastern European Roma in the EU: Mobility, Discrimination, Solutions*. New York: International Debate Education Association.
- European Union (2012) *Charter of Fundamental Rights in the European Union, 2012/C 326/02*. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012P/TXT&from=EN> (assessed February, 2018).
- Fésüs, G., Östlin, P., Mckee, M. & Ádány, R. (2012) 'Policies to improve the health and well-being of Roma people: The European experience', *Health policy*, 105(1), pp. 25-32. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1016/j.healthpol.2011.12.003>

- Fonden project UDENFOR Foundation (2012) *Report on homeless migrants in Copenhagen: The problems and needs of migrants*. Available at: <http://udenfor.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/report-on-homeless-migrants-in-copenhagen.pdf> (accessed April, 2018).
- Gaisbauer, H. P. and Sedmak, C. (2014) 'Neglected futures. Considering overlooked poverty in Europe', *European Journal of Futures Research* 2(57), pp.1-8 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-014-0057-2>
- Geddes, A. (2003) *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Geddes, A. and Scholten, P. (2016) *The politics of migration and immigration in Europe* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Gerdes, C. and Wadensjö, E. (2013) *Immigration to Sweden from the new EU member states, Report No. 5*, Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies, Stockholm, November.
- Golafshani, N. (2003) 'Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research' *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), pp. 597-606. Available at: <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol8/iss4/6> (accessed May, 2018).
- Goldin, I., Cameron, G. and Balarajan, M. (2011) *Exceptional people: How Migration Shaped Our World and Will Define Our Future*. Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Göteborg Stad (2016) *Plan för kommunala insatser som rör EU-medborgare i social och ekonomiskt utsatta situationer som vistast tillfälligt i Göteborg eller i någon av de övriga kommunerna i Göteborgsregionen* [Plan for municipal action involving EU citizens in socially and economically vulnerable situations that reside temporarily in Gothenburg or in one of the other municipalities in the Gothenburg region] Available at: [http://www4.goteborg.se/prod/intraservice/namndhandlingar/SamrumPortal.nsf/1E7EA8AEA1E249A7C1257F5D004DEE36/\\$File/Handling\\_2016\\_nr\\_26.pdf?OpenElement](http://www4.goteborg.se/prod/intraservice/namndhandlingar/SamrumPortal.nsf/1E7EA8AEA1E249A7C1257F5D004DEE36/$File/Handling_2016_nr_26.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed February, 2018).
- Graneheim, U.H. and Lundman, B. (2004) 'Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness', *Nurse Education Today* 24(2), pp.105-112. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001>
- Halfmann, J. (1998) 'Citizenship Universalism, Migration and the Risks of Exclusion', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49(4), pp. 513-533. DOI:10.2307/591286
- Hennink, M. Hutter, I. and Bailey, A. (2012) *Qualitative Research Methods*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hoogeveen, J., Tesliuc, E., Vakis, R. and Dercon, S. (2004) *A Guide to the Analysis of Risk, Vulnerability and Vulnerable Groups*. Available at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSRM/Publications/20316319/RVA.pdf> (accessed April, 2018).

- Hooghe, M., Trappers, A., Meuleman, B. and Reeskens, T. (2008) 'Migration to European countries: a structural explanation of patterns, 1980-2004', *International Migration Review*, **42**(2), pp. 476-504. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/stable/27645259> (accessed April, 2018).
- Ife, J. (2016) 'Human Rights and Social Work: Beyond Conservative Law', *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work* **1**(1), pp. 3-8. DOI: 10.1007/s41134-016-0001-4
- IFSW (2014) *Global definition of Social Work*. Available at: <http://ifsw.org/policies/definition-of-social-work/> (accessed April, 2018).
- Ikram, U. Z., Snijder, M.B., de Wit, M.A.S., Schene, A. H., Stronks, K. and Kunst, A. E. (2016) 'Perceived ethnic discrimination and depressive symptoms: the buffering effects of ethnic identity, religion and ethnic social network', *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, **51**(5), pp. 679-688. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1007/s00127-016-1186-7>
- IOM (n.d.a) *Key migration terms*. Available at: <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms> (accessed April, 2018).
- IOM (n.d.b). *Who is a migrant?* Available at: <https://www.iom.int/who-is-a-migrant> (accessed April, 2018).
- Jørgensen, M. B. (2012) 'The Diverging Logics of Integration Policy Making at National and City Level', *The International Migration Review*, **46**(1), pp. 244-278. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/stable/41428728> (accessed March, 2018).
- Jørgensen, M.B. & Thomsen, T. L. (2013) 'Crises Now and Then - Comparing Integration Policy Frameworks and Immigrant Target Groups in Denmark in the 1970s and 2000s', *International Migration & Integration* **14**(2), pp. 245-262. DOI: 10.1007/s12134-012-0238-4
- Karlsson, L.E., Condahl, K. Andersson, Å. and Sunnemark, F. (2013), 'The Meaning of Health, Well-Being, and Quality of Life Perceived by Roma People in West Sweden'. *Societies* **3**(2), pp. 243-260. DOI: [10.3390/soc3020243](https://doi.org/10.3390/soc3020243)
- Karlsson, M. and Vamstad, J. (2018) 'New Deeds for New Needs: Civil Society Action Against Poverty in Sweden', *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, pp. 1-12. DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1007/s11266-018-9964-3>
- Kastanje, M. and Hoff, N.M. (2017) *Uregistrerede hjemløse udlændinge i København: En erfaringsopsamling fra Kirkens Korshær 2017* [Unregistered homeless foreigners in Copenhagen: Collecting experience from Kirkens Korshær 2017]. Available at: [http://kompasset.kirkenskorshaer.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Kompasset\\_rapport\\_2017\\_dansk.pdf](http://kompasset.kirkenskorshaer.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Kompasset_rapport_2017_dansk.pdf) (accessed March, 2018).
- Københavns Kommune. (2015) *Stofindtagelsesrum på Halmtorvet klar i august 2016* [Drug-intake room at Halmtorvet ready in August 2016]. Available at:

- <https://www.kk.dk/nyheder/stofindtagelsesrum-p%C3%A5-halmtorvet-klar-i-august-2016> (accessed April, 2018).
- Københavns Kommune. (n.d.) *Pulje til transitprogram for særligt udsatte migranter* [Group to transitprogram for particularly vulnerable migrants]. Available at: <https://www.kk.dk/artikel/pulje-til-transitprogram-s%C3%A6rligt-udsatte-migranter> (accessed April, 2018).
- Kolb, M. (2010) 'Emigration, Immigration, and the Quality of Membership: On the Political Economy of Highly Skilled Immigration Politics', in Menz, G. and Caviedes, A. (eds.), *Labour Migration in Europe*, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kruma, K. (2014) *EU Citizenship, Nationality and Migrants Status: An Ongoing Challenge*, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*, London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Länsstyrelsen Stockholm (2017). *Romsk Inkludering: Årsrapport 2016* [Roma Inclusion: Annual report 2016]. Available at: <http://www.lansstyrelsen.se/Stockholm/SiteCollectionDocuments/Sv/publikationer/2017/R2017-09-romsk-inkludering-WEBB.pdf> (accessed January, 2018).
- Law, I. (2012) 'Poverty and Income Maintenance', in Craig, G., Atkin, K. Chattoo, S. and Flynn, R. (eds), *Understanding 'Race' and Ethnicity: theory, history, policy, practice*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon D., Lloyd E. and Patsios D. (2007) '*The Multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*' University of Bristol: Bristol Institute for Public Affairs. Available at: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6853/1/multidimensional.pdf> (accessed February, 2018).
- Lindley, A. (2011) 'Remittances', in Betts, A. (eds), *Global Migration Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lister, R. (2003) *Citizenship: feminist perspective 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lister, R. (2004) *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lund, B. (2002) *Understanding State Welfare: Social Justice or Social Exclusion?* London: Sage Publications.
- Mændenes Hjem (n.d.a) *Blisko - et tilbud for udenlandske stofbrugere* [Blisko - a offer for foreign drug users]. Available at: <http://maendeneshjem.dk/blisko/> (accessed April, 2018).
- Mændenes Hjem (n.d.b) *Om Mændenes Hjem* [About the men's home]. Available at: <http://maendeneshjem.dk/om-maendenes-hjem/> (accessed April, 2018).
- Marshall, T. H. (1964) *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. New York: Doubleday.

- Menz, G. (2010a) 'Employers, Trade Unions, Varieties of Capitalism, and Labour Migration Policies', in Menz, G. and Caviedes, A. (eds.), *Labour Migration in Europe*, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Menz, G. (2010b) 'The Privatization and Outsourcing of Migration Management', in Menz, G. and Caviedes, A. (eds.), *Labour Migration in Europe*, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Menz, G. and Caviedes A. (2010) 'Introduction: Pattern, Trends, and (Ir)Regularities in the Politics and Economics of Labour Migration in Europe', in Menz, G. and Caviedes, A. (eds.), *Labour Migration in Europe*, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Meyer, S. B. & Lunnay, B. (2013) 'The Application of Abductors and Retroactive Inference for the Design and Analysis of Theory-Driven Sociological Research', *Sociological Research Online*, **18**(1). Available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/1/12.html> (accessed May, 2018).
- Mostowska, M. (2014) '“We Shouldn't but We Do...”: Framing the Strategies for Helping Homeless EU migrants in Copenhagen and Dublin', *British Journal of Social Work*, **44**(1), p. 18-34. DOI: 10.1093/bjsw/bcu043
- Mullard, M. (1999) 'Discourses on citizenship: The challenge to contemporary citizenship', in Bussemaker, J. (ed.), *Citizenship and Welfare State Reform in Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Myers, M.D. (1997) *Qualitative Research in Information Systems*. Available at: [https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/11137785/qualitative%20research%20in%20information%20systems.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1526824486&Signature=QFow8T8sDIAOJDc%2BlcPyNh3t%2Bz0%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DQualitative\\_research\\_in\\_information\\_syst.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/11137785/qualitative%20research%20in%20information%20systems.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1526824486&Signature=QFow8T8sDIAOJDc%2BlcPyNh3t%2Bz0%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DQualitative_research_in_information_syst.pdf) (accessed May, 2018).
- Nygren, K. G. and Nyhlén, S. (2017) *Normalising welfare boundaries: A feminist analysis of Swedish municipalities handling of vulnerable EU citizens*. Available at: [http://tntefjournal.hu/vol7/iss2/nygren\\_nyhlen.pdf](http://tntefjournal.hu/vol7/iss2/nygren_nyhlen.pdf) (accessed April, 2018).
- OECD (n.d.) *List of OECS Member countries - Ratification of the Convention on the OECD*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/about/membersandpartners/list-oecd-member-countries.htm> (accessed April, 2018).
- Olwig, K.F. (2011) '“Integration”: migrants and refugees between Scandinavian welfare societies and family relations', *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* **37**(2), pp. 179-196 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1080/1369183X.2010.521327>
- Pusca, A. (2012) Introduction: Moving Toward a Common EU Framework for Roma Integration, in A. Pusca (ed.), *Eastern European Roma in the EU: Mobility, Discrimination, Solutions*, New York: International Debate Education Association.



- Ramiah, A. A. and Hewstone, M. (2013) 'Disrimination Conditions, Consequences, and "Cures"', in Huddy, L., Sears, D.O. and Levy, J. S. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199760107.013.0027
- Ravnbøl, C.I. (2015) 'Hjem og arbejde for hjemløse og arbejdsløse EU medborgere: rumænske romaers erfaringer fra København og Malmø', *Socialmedicinsk tidskrift*, **92**(3), pp. 326-334. Available at: <http://socialmedicinsk.tidskrift.se/index.php/smt/article/view/1324/1548> (accessed January, 2018).
- Recchi, E. and Triandafyllidou, A. (2010) 'Crossing Over, Heading West and South: Mobility, Citizenship and Employment in the Enlarged Europe', in Menz, G. and Caviedes, A. (eds.), *Labour Migration in Europe*, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reichert, E. (2007) 'Introduction: Social Work Perspectives on Human Rights', in Reichert, E. (ed), *Challenges in Human Rights: A Social Work Perspective*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rughinis, C. (2010) 'The forest behind the bar charts: bridging quantitative and qualitative research on Roma/Tigani and contemporary Romania', *Patterns of Prejudice*, **44**(4), pp. 337-367. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0031322X.2010.510716>
- Sainsbury, D. (2012) *Welfare States and Immigrant Rights: The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Oxford: University Press, Oxford.
- Sandberg, J. (2000) 'Understanding Human Competence at Work: An Interpretative Approach', *The Academy of Management Journal* **43**(1), pp. 9-25. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/stable/pdf/1556383.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A2ef0a25b50dcaee1b66f559e658d797d> (accessed May, 2018).
- Schutter, O. (2009) *Links between migration and discrimination: European Network of Legal Expert in the non-discrimination field*. Available at: [http://www.migpolgroup.com/public/docs/166.LinksbtwMigratio&Discrimination\\_thematicreport\\_02.12.09.pdf](http://www.migpolgroup.com/public/docs/166.LinksbtwMigratio&Discrimination_thematicreport_02.12.09.pdf) (accessed February, 2018).
- Schutter, O. (2016). *Links between migration and discrimination: A legal analysis of the situation in EU member States*. Available at: <https://www.equalitylaw.eu/downloads/3917-links-between-migration-and-discrimination> (accessed February, 2018).
- Sedelmeier, U. (2014) *Europe after the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union: 2004-2014*. Available at: <https://www.equalitylaw.eu/downloads/3917-links-between-migration-and-discrimination> (accessed February, 2018).
- Sheppard, M. (2006) *Social Work and Social Exclusion: The Idea of Practice*, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Snape, D. and Spencer, L. (2003) 'The foundations of Qualitative Research', in Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds), *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Reserachers*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Spehar, A. Hinnfors, J. & Bucken-Knapp, G. (2017) 'Passing the buck: The case of failing multilevel governance and vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 7(2), pp. 114-123. DOI:10.1515/njmr-2017-0010
- Spirova, M. and Budd, D. (2008) 'The EU Accession Process and the Roma Minorities in New and Soon-to-be Member States', *Comparative European Politics* 6(1), pp. 81-101. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1057/palgrave.cep.6110123>
- Staub-Bernasconi, S. (2007) 'Economic and Social Rights: The Neglected Human Rights', in E. Reichert (ed), *Challenges in Human Rights: A Social Work Perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Thorkildsen, K. M., Eriksson, K. and Råholm, M-B. (2013) 'The substance of love when encountering suffering: an interpretative research synthesis with an abductive approach', *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Science*, 27, pp. 449-459. DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.01038.x>
- United Nations (n.d.) *What are human rights?* Available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Pages/WhatareHumanRights.aspx> (accessed February, 2018).
- Vamstad, J. (2007) *Governing Welfare: The Third Sector and the Challenges to the Swedish Welfare State*. Mid Sweden University, Östersund Available at: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1597/FULLTEXT01.pdf> (accessed March, 2018).
- Vertelyte, M. (2016) *Local Welcome Policies For EU Mobile Citizens: City report - Copenhagen*. Available at: [http://www.miramedia.nl/media/file/Local-Welcome/Copenhagen\\_city-report.pdf](http://www.miramedia.nl/media/file/Local-Welcome/Copenhagen_city-report.pdf) (accessed January, 2018).
- Wiesbrock, A. (2011) 'The Integration of Immigrants in Sweden: a Model for the European Union?', *International Migration*, 49(4), pp. 48-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2010.00662.x>
- Zamfir, E. (2013) 'Roma People within the Global Process of Change', *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala* 40, pp. 149-165. Available at: <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/docview/1665202512?accountid=11162> (accessed February, 2018).

## Appendix 1: Informed consent 1

### Informed consent 1

The following is a presentation of how I will use the data collected in the interview.

The research project is a part of the international program of Social Work and Human Rights at the Gothenburg University, Sweden. In order to insure that the Project meets the ethical requirements for good research I promise to adhere to the following principles:

- Interviewees in the project will be given information about the purpose of the project (Please see accompanying document titled 'information sheet').
- Interviewees have the right to decide whether he or she will participate in the project, even after the interview has been concluded.
- The collected data will be handled confidentially and will be kept in such a way that no unauthorized person can view or access it. The interview will be recorded as this makes it easier for me to document what is said during the interview and also helps in the continuing work with the project. In my analysis in order for anonymity of the interviewee I will only refer to the interviewee by mentioning the name of the organisation.
- After finishing the project the data will be destroyed. The data we collect will only be used in this project. You have the right to decline answering any questions, or terminate the interview without giving an explanation.

You are welcome to contact my supervisor or myself in case you have any questions (e-mail addresses below).

#### Student

Lilja Thorisdottir  
[gustholik@student.gu.se](mailto:gustholik@student.gu.se)

#### Supervisor

Agneta Hedblom  
[agneta.hedblom@socwork.gu.se](mailto:agneta.hedblom@socwork.gu.se)

Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewee signature \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2: Informed consent 2

### Informed consent 2

The following is a presentation of how I will use the data collected in the interview.

The research project is a part of the international program of Social Work and Human Rights at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. In order to insure that the Project meets the ethical Requirements for good research I to adhere to the following principles:

- Interviewees in the project will be given information about the purpose of the project  
(Please see accompanying document titled 'information sheet').
- Interviewees have the right to decide whether he or she will participate in the project, even after the interview has been concluded.
- The collected data will be handled confidentially and will be kept in such a way that no unauthorized person can view or access it. The interview will be recorded as this makes it easier for me to document what is said during the interview and also helps in the continuing work with the project. In my analysis some data may be changed so that no interviewee will be recognized. In order to keep the anonymity of the interviewees and the organisations, the organisations will be given numbers and only referred to as to for example: "Organisation 1 in Gothenburg" or "organisation 1 in Copenhagen".
- After finishing the project the data will be destroyed. The data we collect will only be used in this project. You have the right to decline answering any questions, or terminate the interview without giving an explanation.

You are welcome to contact my supervisor or myself in case you have any questions (e-mail addresses below).

#### **Student**

Lilja Thorisdottir  
[gustholik@student.gu.se](mailto:gustholik@student.gu.se)

#### **Supervisor**

Agneta Hedblom  
[agneta.hedblom@socwork.gu.se](mailto:agneta.hedblom@socwork.gu.se)

Interviewee \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewee signature \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix 3: Information sheet**

### **Information sheet**

My name is Lilja Thorisdottir and I am a master student in Social Work and Human Rights at Gothenburg University, Sweden. I am undergoing my final thesis and doing so, I wish to conduct a research study about social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen.

If you choose to be involved in this research study, you are welcome to ask questions throughout if you are unsure of certain words or concepts. As a thank you for your participation of this research study, you will be given access to the final thesis upon completion.

### **Purpose of the research project**

As migration flow from Eastern European countries has increase the past years and especially with the EU enlargement of 2004 and 2007 the term vulnerable EU migrant has become recognised. The living condition of this group of migrants is particularly vulnerable in migrating countries such as Sweden and Denmark. Moreover the migrants are exposed to high level of social exclusion and discrimination through out Europe.

The aim of the research is to give an understanding from the third sector perspective how to tackle locally, nationally and internationally, social exclusion and discrimination towards the vulnerable EU migrants who migrate to Scandinavia and focus on Gothenburg and Copenhagen. The aim is furthermore to reflect upon social citizenship within the EU when it comes to EU rights that is, having the right of free movement within the Member States as well as joint labour market and how that could play a role in decreasing or increasing the social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants.

By comparing two Scandinavian cities that in many ways possess similar political views considering the cities are both parts of Scandinavian welfare states, the aim is to see if there can be identified diverse approaches and perspectives towards EU migrants in order to reduce social exclusion and discrimination.

### **Project study procedure**

As a participant of this study, you agree to be interviewed by the researcher face to face. The interview will last approximately sixty minutes. The researcher will ask you questions related to your/ the organisation perspective on how to tackle the social exclusion and discrimination of vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg and Copenhagen and how nationally and internationally the problem could be handled. For analytical purposes, the interviews will be audio-recorded and, later, transcribed.

As you wish both the organisation and you can be kept anonymous at all times. During the analysis, in order to keep the anonymity of the interviewees and the organisations, the organisations will be given numbers and only referred to as to for example: "Organisation 1 in Gothenburg" or "organisation 1 in Copenhagen".

After the interview, you will be asked if you would be available for follow-up questions, which could be posted during another face to face interview, via Skype, or e mail.

## Appendix 4: Interview guide - Gothenburg

### Interview guide - Gothenburg

1. From your viewpoint, can you describe the living conditions of the vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg?
2. Can you describe the work you do with the vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg?
3. On average, how long do the migrants stay in Gothenburg?
  - a. Are you assisting many of the same individuals or are you experiencing new service users regularly?
  - b. How do you reach out or get in contact with them?
4. Are you performing any international or transnational work with the countries the EU migrants come from? If so, could you tell me about that?
5. Do you believe the social exclusion and discrimination differs from their position as migrants in Gothenburg to their position as citizens in their home countries? If so, how?
6. How are you tackling the problem of social exclusion and discrimination, on a local level?
  - a. Or on a national level?
  - b. Or on an international level?
7. Is there something else you could do or you aim to do on a local level that would increase social inclusion and decrease discrimination towards this group of migrants that you aren't already doing?
  - a. Or on a national level?
  - b. Or on an international level?
8. From your point of view how are national authorities (Sweden) reacting towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination among vulnerable EU migrants in Sweden/Gothenburg?
  - a. How could they do better?
9. From your point of view how are international authorities, like EU, reacting towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination among vulnerable EU migrants in Scandinavia?
  - a. How could they do better?

10. Where do you think the responsibility lies when it comes to tackling the problem of social exclusion and discrimination towards vulnerable EU migrants? Local, national or international? Why?
11. To what extent do you think the migrants are familiar with the rights they have as EU citizens?
12. How do you think the status as a social citizenship of EU affects the social exclusion and discrimination of the vulnerable EU migrants in Gothenburg?
13. On a local level, how do you think the city of Gothenburg takes into consideration the social citizenship of EU migrants?
14. On a national level, how do you think the Swedish authorities take into consideration the social citizenship of EU migrants?
15. Any other thoughts are something you would like to add on the whole topic?



## Appendix 5: Interview guide - Copenhagen

### Interview guide - Copenhagen

1. From your viewpoint, can you describe the living conditions of the migrants in Copenhagen?
2. Can you describe the work you do with the vulnerable EU migrants in Copenhagen?
3. On average, how long do the migrants stay in Copenhagen?
  - a. Are you assisting many of the same individuals or are you experiencing new service users regularly?
  - b. How do you reach out or get in contact with them?
4. Are you performing any international or transnational work with the countries the EU migrants come from? If so, could you tell me about that?
5. Do you believe the social exclusion and discrimination differs from their position as migrants in Copenhagen to their position as citizens in their home countries? If so, how?
6. How are you tackling the problem of social exclusion and discrimination, on a local level?
  - a. Or on a national level?
  - b. Or on an international level?
7. Is there something else you could do or you aim to do on a local level that would increase social inclusion and decrease discrimination towards this group of migrants that you aren't already doing?
  - a. Or on a national level?
  - b. Or on an international level?
8. From your point of view how are national authorities (Denmark) reacting towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination among vulnerable EU migrants in Denmark/Copenhagen?
  - a. How could they do better?
9. From your point of view how are international authorities, like EU, reacting towards decreasing social exclusion and discrimination among vulnerable EU migrants in Scandinavia?
  - a. How could they do better?

10. Where do you think the responsibility lies when it comes to tackling the problem of social exclusion and discrimination towards vulnerable EU migrants? On local, national or international level? Why?
11. To what extent do you think the migrants are familiar with the rights they have as EU citizens?
12. How do you think the status as a social citizenship of EU affects the social exclusion and discrimination of the vulnerable EU migrants in Copenhagen?
13. On a local level, how do you think the city of Copenhagen takes into consideration the social citizenship of EU migrants?
14. On a national level, how do you think the Danish authorities take into consideration the social citizenship of EU migrants?
15. Any other thoughts are something you would like to add on the whole topic?