

# Master Thesis



## **The effects on deportation policy through societal activism against deportation**

An analysis of four poignant cases in the Netherlands

---

Name	Suzanne Wevers – 485605
Date	16-06-2019
First reader	M. van Houte MSc
Second reader	Dr. A. S. Leerkes
Educational programme	Grootstedelijke Vraagstukken en Beleid
Faculty	Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences
Institute	Erasmus University Rotterdam

## **Abstract**

This study focused on newspaper articles with information about protest activities and policy changes in asylum policy, and is aimed to understand the influence of societal protest activities on asylum policy, and if so how, which actors and what activities have contributed to possible policy changes and how this changed between 2005 and 2018. Four individual poignant cases were analyzed, all involving children. The data consisted of approximately 100 newspaper articles from national and local newspapers, which were selected through convenience sampling. The results show that protest activities and media attention of the beneficiary could contribute to policy changes. Especially when NGOs and academics are gaining interest in the cases, the used arguments can influence policy. NGOs and academics are showing negative effects on psychological development of children, while friends and families are showing more emotional reasons to protect the beneficiary from deportation. Due to the individual cases and public pressure, the asylum issue has always been on the agenda of the Second Chamber. However, outcomes of deportation decisions are different for children who reached the media and for children who did not.

**Keywords:** protest, deportation, asylum policy, poignant, children's pardon

## Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Theoretical framework	6
2.1. Social movement theory	6
2.2. Resource mobilization theory	7
2.3. Victim or intruder?	9
3. Method and data	11
3.1. Research method - discourse analysis	11
3.2. Data collection	12
3.3. Reliability and validity	12
3.4. Limitations	13
4. Results	13
4.1. Poignant asylum cases between 2005 and 2018 in the Netherlands	14
4.2. Protest activities and actors in protesting	16
4.3. Argumentation	19
4.4. Policy consequences	20
5. Conclusion	21
6. Discussion	24
Reference list	24
Appendix	30

## 1. Introduction

When children, teenagers, young adults are involved in deportation and asylum processes which are to the detriment of these persons, activism against national and international asylum policies rises (Kos, Maussen & Doomernik, 2015). Especially supporters for these children's poignant situations argue that the level of cultural and social integration in society is one reason to grant a residence status and protect the children from deportation (Kos, Maussen & Doomernik, 2015). This discussion emphasizes that children have been forming 'social ties' with their local community, such as schools and other social organizations, which should provide them a right to stay, no matter what policies implies, or the duration of their illegal residence. Another argument for supporters to grant a residence permit is that the young 'illegal' immigrants have good prospects to contribute to the receiving society (ibid.). Activism against the deportation of poignant cases resides when actors have personal connections with the person involved. According to Rosenberger and Winkler (2014), "the deportation orders trigger feelings of unease, grievance, and outrage that manifest themselves in different forms of protest and move people to engage in collective activities". If people feel emotionally attached to the disadvantaged individual, protests mainly start within the personal environment of deportees at the local level, where ordinary citizens, acquaintances, friends, classmates, colleagues, or neighbors speak up for "their" asylum seeker (ibid.). How this activism is expressed, depends on several factors, such as time period, technology, mindset and protest possibilities, however, examples can be found in forms of direct demonstrations, signing petitions and providing help to the beneficiary. In addition, Rosenberg and Winkler (2014) mention that protest activities in order to protect poignant asylum seekers from deportation can arise from the idea that these asylum seekers are 'fully integrated' in society and could positively contribute to the economy of the host society. When integrated asylum seekers have proven their morality, contribution and honesty, protesters use the argument of deservingness. Asylum seekers should not be deported if they meet these requirements (Bader & Probst, 2018).

Besides from public protest deportation policies, also the asylum seekers themselves have become more out of the shadows in order to protect their rights in their host country. According to Swerts (2015), undocumented children have reached the public debate by sharing their precarious stories. By telling and showing their stories to the public, asylum-seeking children were able to mobilize constituencies, recruiting member for protest and legitimize grievances (ibid.). Since children with an undocumented legal status cannot interfere in politics, they try to mobilize other actors with their stories to take political action in order to gain attention in politics and possible policy changes. Emotions play a key role in doing this. Emotions and narratives are key factors for marginalized groups to incorporate in societal communities in their host country and could create empathy understanding

of the audience (ibid). The audience feels more connected to the disadvantaged child since emotions could create formations of seeing the asylum seeker as part of 'us' instead of 'them' (ibid). Therefore, the undocumented child is also an important factor in establishing so called social movements.

Carroll and Hackett (2006) mention that collective activism can arise from the approach of social movement theory. Social movements have historically varied in ideologies, but their main goal was to generate changes in society. In this paper, protecting the beneficiary from deportation and changes in deportation policies were the main goals of the public discourse. These authors have analyzed whether activism through media points to blind spots or to potential new directions for the social movement theory (Carroll & Hackett, 2006). In other words, is media activism able to change or influence greater societal issues and what is its political significance and potential? In addition, Tazreiter (2010) has researched collective action to protect asylum seekers and how these collective social movements have emerged. According to her research, non-governmental organizations such as Defense for Children in the Netherlands, engage in several forms of protest and direct action in order to address the precarious situations of children in asylum processes. The main goal of these organizations is to create awareness among politicians and the public, which might lead to membership from supporters with similar values. If social organizations rise in size, Tazreiter (2010) mentioned that attracting media attention is inevitable. When issues are becoming a hot topic in the media, politicians and policy makers will include the topic in their agenda setting (ibid.). Since the media was the main platform where activism was held against the deportation decisions of the four poignant cases in this paper, collective action through the lens of the social movement theory will be conceptualized.

In this paper, I would like to investigate how activism has changed in the period 2005 to 2018 and to what extent public activism has contributed to legal decisions and possible changes in deportation policy, based on four poignant cases in the Netherlands. The four cases were selected for several reasons. First, all the cases involved children who were in the Netherlands for more than five years. All these children were fully integrated, which means that they participated in education, have native language proficiency in Dutch, and created their social and entrepreneurial networks in the Netherlands (Jacobs & Tillie, 2004). Second, all the cases gathered national (and international) media attention. The public was able to gain information about the four cases through internet and/or newspapers, which created an aversion to deportation policies in the Netherlands since the cases with children involved were seen as 'inhuman' and 'controversial' (ibid.). Third, all the cases took place in another time period and had different outcomes, which could highlight different forms of activism, arguments, and mechanisms that have contributed to or influenced deportation policy.

The societal relevance of the topic of poignant asylum cases can be found in the growing public and political debates about deportation policies. In society, poignant cases have created increased

polarization between supporters and opponents of asylum and deportation policy (Bader & Probst, 2018). Supporters aim to reach less restrictive policies regards to children or families with children who are living for several years in the Netherlands. Opponents aim to maintain current policies about deportation, even though this means that children or families with children must leave the country after several years (Bader & Probst, 2018). Furthermore, political parties have discussed the topic of poignant cases, in order to find solutions for similar cases. Investigating forms of activism and changes in asylum policy in several time periods could contribute to gather new insights in asylum policy and patterns of public activism, whereby politicians could faster and more effectively anticipate and response in future poignant deportation issues. The academic relevance of this topic can be found in several reasons. First, the role of activism and media remains under-explored in research on deportation policy process that has largely focused on the actions of government bureaucrats, elite politicians and organized public, however, in this case, I would like to compare four different poignant cases in order to investigate whether forms of activism in the Netherlands have changed over time, and how this could have influenced deportation policies. Previous empirical literature on social movements and collective activism has mainly focused on the causes of social movements, their successes and their possible ability to reach certain policy goals. However, few researchers have analyzed these movements in terms of their actual participation and influence in democratic policy making, especially for marginalized groups (Weldon, 2011). In addition, I will mainly focus on positive opinions towards immigrants or asylum seekers, which is the opposite of the mainly used negative framing theories on immigrants. In order to investigate whether activism and protest have changed between the cases and how this activism has influenced deportation policy, the following research question has been established:

**To what extent has public activism against the deportation of four poignant asylum cases involving children between 2005 and 2018 changed and how have these activism activities influenced deportation policy in the Netherlands?**

In order to answer the main research question, several sub questions are designed. The first three questions will be based on previous literature, the last two questions will be answered by empirical research of the collected data.

Theoretical questions:

1. What specific forms of activism were used during the four cases?
2. Which actors mainly initiated and contributed activism activities during the four cases?

3. What arguments were used during the public discourse of the four cases?

Empirical questions:

4. What were the immediate consequences of the activism for the individual cases?
5. Which wider general deportation policy changes can be traced back to these individual cases?

## 2. Theoretical framework

The relation between public activism and changes in deportation policy can be explained by three concepts: the social movement theory approach, which explains how public activism can arise, the resource mobilization approach (RMT), which explains what forms of activism have manifested traditionally and currently, and which actors contribute and manage public activism, and finally, the discursive strategies of actors, which explains what arguments are used in the asylum debate in order to identify an asylum seeker as a victim or as an intruder. These three concepts will be conceptualized in this chapter, in order to provide plausible answers regards to the central question and the first three sub questions.

### 2.1. Social movement theory

Defining a social movement can be different. It is not a tangible group of persons, but also not a political party or political entities with access to politics and political decisions. It is nor an unorganized trend of mass fad without any goals. Social movements are a combination of the above (Freeman & Johnson, 1999). Social movements can be seen as organized, yet informal social communities that are concerned with societal issues, in order to reach a specific goal. These goals can consist of efforts to change narrow or specific policies or change cultural aspects (ibid.). Social movements can also arise in the media. Carrol and Hackett (2006) conceptualize media activism to create or influence media practices and strategies, in order to gain public attention, change the public opinion or initiate policy changes. New Social Movements (NSMs) mainly focuses on *why* these movements arose in Europe in the late 20s, and why specific forms of activism and collective identity appeared (Melucci, 1989). NSMs do not see themselves as organizations with common interests, but rather as new forms of collective identity (Cohen, 1985). Weldon (2011) explains social movements as a type of mediating institution that is representing a marginalized group in society. This explanation is more applicable to the four cases in this paper since the individuals in these cases are part of a marginalized group. In order to understand how collective action and collective activism can arise, cost and benefits of engaging in social movements have to be evaluated. Historic reasons such as interest, opposing ideologies and different opinions, are not enough to explain the emergence of collective action (De la Porta & Diani, 2006). Also, the conditions which enable discontent transforming into mobilization have to be studied.

Mobilization capacity depends on several material resources, such as money, work, benefits and services, and nonmaterial resources, such as authority, faith, friendship and moral engagement (ibid.). Rosenberg (2014) asks why people or organizations would participate in social movements. Reasons can be found on the micro-level, which include individual incentives and motives to participate, such as social relations with the beneficiary. The macro-level represents incentives and motives from national or international actors. These macro-level actors do not have personal relationships with the beneficiaries, rather they strive for moral or political incentives, such as human rights, free movement of persons, protection of marginalized groups and equal treatment (Rosenberg, 2014). In this paper, the four cases will be analyzed in order to explore whether these cases initiated social movements and how activism within these movements emerged.

## **2.2. Resource Mobilization Theory**

In order to understand how and why actors intervene in protests and activism, the resource mobilization theory (RMT) can be used. This approach mainly focuses on *how* movements arise and engage in collective action. RMT “emphasizes the shared interest and forms of social organization that underlie and issue from processes of mobilization as a social group engages in the pursuit of common interest” (Carrol & Hackett, 2006). Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans (2013) give several reasons how collective protest can arise according to the resource mobilization approach. These authors are suggesting that efficacy, identity, emotions, social embeddedness, and resource mobilization are predictive factors for why people participate in protesting (ibid.). Efficacy is the individual’s expectation that through protest, individuals can actually make a difference. This is in line with the sociological aspect of *agency*, whereby individuals expect that their actions will have an effect or will change the societal structure. Efficacy can be divided into group efficacy, whereby groups with common interest expect that the societal problems can be solved through collective action, and political efficacy, whereby activism through political participation can change politics (Van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2013). People are more likely to protest when they have the feeling that their actions can influence policy. Theories on identity explain that people with strong common identity feelings are more likely to participate in protests (ibid.). Emotions can be expressed in several ways and could explain why people interfere in protest activities. Anger is seen as the main emotion for protest (Van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2013). Especially when groups have shared anger emotions, collective protest activities for disadvantaged groups will arise. Social embeddedness explains the role of social networks in protest activities (ibid.). When people have social networks they trust and respect, people are more likely to participate in protest activities when people in their social networks are trying to recruit them. Mobilization can be divided into two forms of mobilization, consensus mobilization, and action mobilization. The latter is broken down in four steps, people need to feel sympathy with the



beneficiary, they need to be informed about upcoming protesting activities, and finally, they must want to and be able to participate (Van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2013). In this paper, I will analyze which and how actors were involved in protest activities.

In order to understand the actors in protest, Bader and Probst (2018) explain the actor structure in three steps. The *initiator* is the individual who starts the protest, the *hard core of support*, a few actors uniting with the initiator because of their shared common interest in the protest and *the network*, which consist of civil society members who are strengthening the protest in an either qualitative or quantitative manner. The initiator is not a randomly chosen person; however, in all the deportation cases that Bader and Probst have analyzed, it is an individual with weak ties with the beneficiary, however, with compassion to the beneficiary's situation. It is mostly a person where the beneficiary can expect help and support from, but not from his personal and close network, since these people mostly lack knowledge of deportation policy. In order to find an initiator, the beneficiary has to take the first step in exposing his or her precarious and insecure situation to the public. When the initiator has started activism, he or she tries to recruit and encourage the 'strong ties', such as close relationships and acquaintances in order to protest collectively. After this phase, the hard core of support stage will occur. The hard core of support will consist of a few citizens who are strongly committed to the case. These citizens are strongly dedicated to defending the right to stay for the beneficiary to the very end, even though they might face negative consequences in terms of energy, financial resources and time (ibid.). Mostly, these citizens are willing to participate in the protest, because of their profound values such as human rights, social justice or personal relation with the beneficiary (ibid.). The hard core supporters try to recruit other persons with weak ties to the beneficiary, in order to strengthen the protest quantitatively, by for example expanding the network with signing petitions, and qualitatively, by for example using powerful or professional skills from others. Thus, the network does not actively participate in protest activities, but provides either complementary or additional tools to the hard-core supporters (ibid.). The actors focused in this research can be divided in several groups according to a report from Maussen and Versteegt (2012):

- Non-governmental organizations. These NGO's can act on behalf of the welfare of the asylum seekers, also on national or local level. Examples of Dutch NGO's are VluchtelingenWerk Nederland or National Support for the Undocumented. The first NGO mainly consists of professionals; the latter mostly relies on volunteers.
- Non-governmental organizations involved with human rights or asylum law. These organizations mainly act on behalf of larger issues, in order to create national or international awareness. In addition, these organizations such as UNICEF, Defence for Children, Amnesty International and Human Right Watch often request for policy changes.

- Churches and religious or humanistic NGOs involved with charity. These organizations care for the needy and could exist of organizations such as Kerk in Actie and INLIA, but also all other institutions who try to help homeless people, vulnerable people, and those in special needs.
- Academics. Several academics are researching poignant issues regards to human rights, psychological factors or asylum law, which will contribute to debate and protest.
- Media and journalists. These two actors mainly presenting the poignant cases to the public and are able to broadcast different perspectives from which to describe the issues.

### 2.3. Victim or intruder?

In order to answer sub question 3, the main actors and groups involved in protest activities against asylum policy and their discursive strategies in protest activities will be analyzed. In order to understand the discursive strategies of actors, Maussen and Versteegt (2012) have constructed a discursive space which gives me the opportunity to analyze debates on asylum policy. In this debate, two questions are central:

- Is the beneficiary a victim?
- Should the government provide assistance to this beneficiary?

By answering these questions, four outcomes are possible. If the beneficiary turned out to be a victim in asylum debates, and the government is responsible for providing assistance, there is acceptance among citizens. If the beneficiary is seen as an intruder, but still need assistance from the government, with for example repatriation, there is tolerance. If the beneficiary is seen as a victim, however, when the government is withdrawing support or not providing assistance, NGOs are allowed to assist the beneficiary. This is called indifferent. When the beneficiary is seen as an intruder, and the government should not provide assistance, there is intolerance. In order to identify what arguments are used to qualify an asylum seeker as victim or intruder, the theoretical approach of 'victim or intruder' of Van Gorp (2005) will be used. This approach is showing two opposite reasoning in the asylum debate. One discourse where the asylum seeker is depicted as an intruder and one discourse where the asylum seeker is seen as a victim. Van Gorp's (2005) theoretical approach of intruder and victim can be divided into four dominant discourses of protest: asylum authenticity discourse, global injustice discourse, duty of care discourse and the accomplished cultural inclusion discourse. The asylum authenticity discourse is focusing on whether an asylum seeker has applied for a refugee status under the Geneva Convention and applicable laws (Versteegt & Maussen, 2012). The main question in this discourse is whether a person's life is in danger or whether human rights are violated. If yes, the person is seen as a victim (ibid.). The global injustice discourse is focusing on "real" or "fake" refugees. This means

whether refugees have poor prospects when they go back to their country of origin or not. If yes, the person is seen as a victim. This discourse finds that victims should be granted a residence permit (ibid.). The duty of care discourse is mainly focusing on helping vulnerable groups – children, elderly – especially on the municipality level. If these vulnerable groups are in need, municipalities and governments should support the beneficiary by giving them shelter, education and a residence permit (ibid.). The cultural inclusion discourse is focusing whether a person belongs to the Netherlands or not. The idea behind this discourse is that it is unfair to let children live for many years in the Netherlands, and then, after several years, deport them to a – for them – unknown country. After these years, they are integrated and rooted; therefore, they should not be deported (ibid.).

Public activism can take several forms of expression. Traditional forms of activism took place in manifestations of political participation. People try to achieve personal goals by direct political participation such as voting or joining political associations (Diaz Romero, 2014). Activism has evolved during history, whereby other forms of participation aroused. These traditional forms of activism consisted of demonstrations, boycotts and signing petitions. When several people have common interests, organizations or protest groups can arise. Their main common goal is to influence deportation policy (ibid.). During the digital revolution, especially online websites have incorporated forms of activism, which allowed a greater flow of information for an increasing public. With easier access to information, people can start, coordinate and manage online and offline protest events. One example of current online activism is a petition. This is an online statement, where people can show their support by signing it. Due to technological developments, people can read the arguments for the petition online and are also able to sign it online. Eventually, if the petition is growing in signature numbers, the petition will be regarded to the target (e.g. politicians) (Earl, 2006). In line with Earl (2006), Neumayer and Svensson (2016) mentioned the increased importance of online activism. These authors see an increasing use and importance of social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter. The online platforms are part of the democracy, mobilize participant's opinions, and are accessible to a greater audience than ever before. Social media platform can be used for expressing opinions, identities, starting and coordinating protests and connecting individuals with shared arguments (ibid.). This is in line with offline activism, which is more taking place on the streets with, for example, protests marches, organizing fundraising events and demonstrations. Both online as offline activism are both sites where resistance can be expressed (Neumayer & Svensson, 2016). This does not mean that traditional forms of activism have disappeared or have lost force. It only has transformed into new forms of activism, transnational policy networks and international digital activism (Diaz Romero, 2014). Based on the changing forms and actors of activism, it can be expected that the influence of this activism on policy changes has different outcomes. Because of the digital revolution, and greater access to the

internet and online media platforms, initiators of protest activities are more able to reach a greater target group (Diaz Romero, 2014).

### 3. Method and data

#### 3.1. Research method - discourse analysis

In order to answer the sub questions, I will conduct a discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a study to how text and communication are becoming meaningful and how these texts and communications have contributed to social reality, and in this paper, in protest activities (Phillips and Hardy, 2002). Discourse analysis is part of content analysis, which is according to Bryman (2012) “a research technique for the systematic, objective and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication”, which makes it appropriate in identifying characteristics of messages in the mass media. In addition, content analysis is a transparent research technique because of coding schemes and clear samples, which makes it replicable and feasible to increase reliability (ibid.).

In order to analyze protest activities in sub questions 1 and 2, a protest event analysis (PEA) will be used. The protest event analysis allows me a systematic gathering of protesting activities in media articles, such as date, duration, actors, form, claims, and action type. This analysis can be used, because according to Rosenberg and Winkler (2014), most interaction and observation between the public, authorities and protesters are broadcast through the media. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, sub question 3 will be answered based on the victim or intruder theory. Arguments according to the four dominant discourses were labelled, and the victim or intruder question has been applied to each newspaper article.

For research questions 4 and 5, I will conduct a document analysis, which will provide insight into direct and indirect outcomes of the four individual cases, and the possible policy changes. For answering these questions, I will analyze newspaper articles regards to the poignant cases in this paper according to *process tracing*, which is a qualitative research tool, in order to investigate whether relationships within case-analysis are causal (Collier, 2011). This method is implemented in this research paper, since it analyses trajectories of change and causation (ibid.). Process tracing is an analytic method for giving descriptive and causal inferences from diagnostic pieces of temporal events or phenomena evidence (ibid.). In carrying a process tracing out, I will look for the influence of protest activities in relation to policy decisions. I will do this by searching the name of the individual case in newspaper articles where policy changes are discussed. Also policy documents including evidence of policy changes caused by the beneficiary are included in the analysis. By doing this, I will be able to find patterns and relationships between the beneficiary's name and possible policy changes.

During the analyzing phase, a coding scheme and a coding manual will be used. The coding scheme is a scheme with all items that will be selected during the coding stage. In this case, the items will consist of variables as 'petition', 'demonstration', 'children's pardon', 'human rights', 'discretionary power' and 'policy changes'. However, due to the iterative process of this research, other related and relevant variables could be included during the coding process. The coding scheme is based on the coding manual, which will provide more information about the variables, for example statements of instructions, categories, and interpretation (Bryman, 2012). I will use Excel, which assists me in finding patterns and/or differences in activism activities and public views on rejected asylum seekers in the four cases. Excel is often used in social science research, because the process can be more transparent and replicable in order to create more credibility and reliability, which is highly preferred in social science research (Hwang, 2008). After organizing the codes in Excel, it is possible to see how often specific codes are used and in which context. This will help me find patterns and interpret the meanings of the codes (Bryman, 2012).

### **3.2. Data collection**

For this study, several newspaper articles focused on the beneficiary are collected by convenience sampling (Bryman, 2012). This means that I used accessible articles focused on the cases, only if they met some criteria. Convenience sampling is a form of sampling when the data is easy accessible to the researcher, which saves time and costs (ibid.). The articles should have included the beneficiary's name, and (depending on the sub questions) a form of protest activity, argumentation, or actors. If an article title consisted of one of these criteria, I read the article in order to identify whether or not it can be included in the analysis. I used the online database NexisUni to find articles, which comprises newspaper articles from a great amount of regional, national and international newspapers. Word searching for each individual case's name on the database NexisUni provided me a selection of published news articles about the cases. All the selected newspaper articles are concerned with one of the cases, including information regarding the sub questions. I started by searching the beneficiary's name, including several spellings, in order to collect as much as articles. Each case consists of around 25 articles, divided by subject. For example, I used ten articles with general information about the case, five articles with explicit forms of protest, five articles from NGO websites and five articles where policy consequences were named. After collecting these 25 articles, data saturation took place, which means that extra articles were not providing new information about the case (Reis, Van der Geest, & Gerrits, 2008). The context of certain words, instead of the frequency of words, can sometimes be significant, since it can reveal the predilection of sensationalizing the researched issue (Bryman, 2012).

### **3.3. Validity and reliability**

In order to guarantee the most important criteria for evaluation of social research, I will focus on reliability and validity (Bryman, 2012). Reliability is referring to whether this research is replicable (ibid.). Since I will collect and organize all articles that will be analyzed, it is possible for further researchers to use these articles. Besides, since I will only use open accessible documentation, further researchers are also able to use this data (ibid.). Replicability will also be guaranteed with the use of a codebook. This codebook provides in detail descriptions and interpretations of the used codes (ibid.). The concept of validity is whether the analyzed data is in relation to the previously studied literature and theories regards to the issue. Validity in this paper is guaranteed according to the concept of triangulation (ibid.). Triangulation means using more than one research method or data sources in social studies (ibid.). In this paper, several data sources will be analyzed, including media articles, policy documentation, and in addition, shared communication on social media networks. By comparing these data sources, the researcher will create objectivity and is able to determine whether the researcher has missed relevant information or misunderstood something (ibid.).

### **3.4. Limitations**

The first limitation of this study is the relationship between the analyzed documents and the conclusions. It is important to keep in mind that journalists can take their own viewpoint on each case, which can influence content of newspaper messages. This means that the newspaper articles are not always value-free, and therefore, it is difficult to conclude causal relationships. The second limitation of this study is its qualitative character. Because of this, it is not possible to generalize, since each case was unique and had different outcomes. The cases were representing similar situations, however, when these other children in similar situations do not reach media attention, their outcomes can be completely different than the outcomes of the researched cases. The third limitation of this study is that all cases took place in a similar political context. During all cases, politicians from opposition parties were designated as state secretary. Therefore, it can be expected that their decisions are also similar. When other cases were chosen, in four completely different political contexts, the outcomes of the last sub questions could be completely different, which could influence the answer on the main research question.

## **4. Results**

In this section, the results are presented. Based on the results, a comparative analysis is executed. With the results, I will try to give proper answers to the research questions; therefore, this section is divided into four paragraphs, each paragraph is linked to a sub question. First, background information

regards to each case are explained, in order to create context. Second, protest activities, actors, arguments and policy changes are explained based on the results.

#### **4.1. Poignant asylum cases between 2005 and 2018**

The first researched case of this thesis was the case of Taïda Pasic. During this case, the executing state secretary was Rita Verdonk, from the VVD (People's Party for Freedom and Democracy). The VVD was, in combination with CDA (Christian Democratic Appeal), against more tolerant treatment of asylum seekers, including rejected asylum children. Taïda and her family fled Kosovo in 1999, because she and her family belong to an Islamic minority, which is discriminated and threatened in Kosovo (Michielsen, 2006). At that time, she was 12 years old. Their asylum application in the Netherlands was rejected two years later, because The IND (Immigration and Naturalization Service) stated Kosovo as a safe country. The family left one year later, on advice from *VluchtelingenWerk Nederland* and with 7000 Euros for establishing a new life in Kosovo. However, Taïda wanted to finish her schoolyear in the Netherlands, which was only four months left. She applied for a French tourist visa to return to the Netherlands. With this visa, she attended the last months of her schoolyear in the Netherlands, and after that, she went on family visitation in France. Minister Verdonk saw this as fraud and rejected her application for educational purpose, arguing that she should have stayed in the country of her visa application, in this case France. Besides, her educational application was rejected twice, since the IND claimed that the level and quality of education in Kosovo and the Netherlands are similar. However, Taïda's lawyer did not agree on the fraud accusation, and started a legal procedure in order to protect Taïda, since she was able to move freely in the Schengen area with this visa. According to her lawyer "did Taïda everything to receive her diploma, however, she never exceeded the law". Due to this legal procedure, Taïda was able to stay with the Meulenkamp family in Winterswijk, her foster family from 2004. In 2006, her graduating year, she was suddenly arrested and taken into custody in a detention center in Rotterdam. She was deported to Bosnia, where her father lived. Her situation gathered enormous social outrage and media attention, since Taïda lived since 1999 in the Netherlands and her accusation of fraud, which was eventually withdrawn by Rita Verdonk. Taïda eventually graduated for her high school diploma on the Embassy of the Netherlands in Sarajevo. In august 2006, she started a law study in Leiden on a study visa (Van den Berg, 2018). The first media coverage of Taïda's case dated from 20 January 2006 and the last media coverage dated from 23 March, 2019 (NexisUni, n.d.).

The second case was Mauro Manuel's case. During this case, Gerd Leers from CDA was executing the role of state secretary. As in Taïda's case, the CDA was against more tolerance for asylum seekers. Mauro Manuel reached tremendous national and international media attention in 2011, because of possible deportation to his country of origin, Angola. Mauro entered the Netherlands individually in 2002 when he was just eight years old and lived with a foster family for several years.

He was sent on a plane by his birth mother, because she was unable to take care of him (BNN VARA, 2011). However, due to his minor age and his arrival without accompanying adult, Mauro received the status as AMA (unaccompanied minor asylum-seeker) (Maussen & Versteegt, 2012). His original asylum application in 2007 was rejected. His foster family started an adoption procedure, with permission from his birth mother in Angola, to keep Mauro protected from deportation. However, lacking legal documents with evidence of permission of Mauro's birth mother resulted in a rejection of the adoption, and the minister of Justice also rejected his second application for asylum. This process created public and political resistance, which resulted in activism from the public and support from politicians and several non-governmental organizations. Eventually, Mauro received a residence permit from the Dutch government. The state secretary approved a study visa by which he could finish his secondary vocational education in ICT, not by using his discretionary power (Van den Dool, 2013). The first newspaper article of Mauro's case dated from 12 August 2011 and the last article dated from 2 May 2019 (NexisUni, n.d.)

The third case was Lili and Howick's case. During this case, Mark Harbers of the political party VVD was executing the role of state secretary. Lili and Howick are two Armenian children, who fled to the Netherlands with their mother in 2008 (NU.nl, 2019). In 2009, their asylum application has been rejected, since mother Armina lied about her nationality, however, their mother decided to continue applying for years for a resident permit. After ten years of applications and procedures, the children's mother has been deported to Armenia. In order to prevent the children from deportation, the mother hides the children in a family with children where Lili and Howick were in a safe environment (ibid.). The reasons for this hiding were that the children did not speak the Armenian language and were fully rooted in the Dutch society. Eventually, when the children were still in hiding, the state secretary of Justice decided to use his discretionary power and grant a residence permit for the children, since their situation was uncertain, and the government could not guarantee their safety. The state secretary never admitted that his decision was a result of public pressure and protests. The case caused many indignant and angry reactions from society, and even four official police institutions called for a change in policy for children in similar situations as Lili and Howick (ibid.). The first newspaper article of Lili and Howick's case dated from 13 August 2018 and the last article dated from 12 June 2019 (NexisUni, n.d.)

The last researched case of this thesis is the Andropov family. During this case, the executive state secretary was still Mark Harbers. The Ukrainian family Andropov consists of three children, Maksim (14), Denis (10) and Arina (5) and their parents. The family fled Ukraine in 2002 and resided in the city of Culemborg. After thirteen years of illegal residence, the family decided to start in vain with asylum application procedures. The children were all born in the Netherlands, do not speak Ukrainian, and are going to schools in the Netherlands. In 2018, several police officers entered their house and



arrested the family in order to deport them to Ukraine. The family was arrested and incarcerated in detention center Zeist. Despite all the support for this family, demonstrations, petitions and emergency letters to the state secretary, the entire family has been deported to Ukraine, accompanied by seven military policemen. The family has been picked up by an international Christian church in Kiev (Geen Kind Aan De Kant, 2019). The first newspaper article of Mauro's case dated from 3 July 2018 and the last article dated from 31 January 2019 (NexisUni, n.d.)

#### **4.2. Protest activities and actors in protesting**

During all cases, several forms of activism were used, and several actors were involved. Foremost petitions, demonstrations and emergency letters to the state secretary were used to keep the beneficiaries protected from deportation. For example, friends of Taïda initiated a petition which has been signed by over 60,000 people, and which was handed to state secretary Rita Verdonk, in order to show much empathy for Taïda, and their opposition against current asylum policy. Especially petitions were found in each case.

One interesting form of protest activity in Taïda's case compared to the other cases, were marriage proposals. Several people proposed Taïda on the initiators petition website "TekenVoorTaïda". Initiator B. Brandenburg stated that especially "pretty shy boys are proposing Taïda, with the argument that they only have to meet once or twice". This form of protest is only seen by Taïda, and not used in the other cases. This can might be explained by her age and gender, and as a form of symbolic protest. Another remarkable observation is that Taïda's case has never been discussed on social media, nor was she trending topic on any social media website. Mauro, Lili and Howick and the Andropov family were heavily discussed on social media, including groups and petition websites where citizens could give their opinion and show solidarity to the beneficiary. This can might be explained by the growing use of social media since 2010 (Turpijn, Kneefel, Van der Veer, 2015). In addition, lawyers of each case seemed an influential factor, except in the Andropov case. The role of the lawyer was often important, since the lawyer had expertise in asylum and deportation law and was fighting against decisions from the higher court. The lawyers often represented the beneficiary and fought for their rights.

Other important actors in protest activities were different NGOs. Each case included one or multiple NGOs and their contribution to the process. A pattern of influential NGOs can be found in between the four cases. First, VluchtelingenWerk Nederland has been mainly visible during the process of Taïda. Besides, financial supporters as the Van Beek-Donner foundation gained interest in Taïda, since her high level of education and strong perseverance. The goal of this foundation is to generate independence for young women in Rotterdam. Therefore, this foundation offered financial support for finishing her high school and eventually starts studying at a university. This financial support cannot be

found in other cases, except in Mauro's case. He also received financial support to finish his ICT study. However, since Mauro's case, the NGO Defence for Children became extremely visible. This NGO organizes demonstrations petitions, but perhaps most interesting, they started research in order to investigate children's behavior when they are deported after five years of living in the Netherlands. They initiated this research during Lili and Howick's case. With this research of 38 scientists, Defence for Children is trying to convince politics and government to not deport children who lived longer than five years in the Netherlands because of strong psychological damage children will experience then. This psychological damage has not been named in Taïda's case, perhaps since her situation was a relatively new phenomenon and the state secretary was obligated to follow the rules and protocols. Over the years, psychological damage and children's right have become more important in deportation considerations for children due to the introduced Children's Rights Treaty of the United Nations. This treaty consists of 54 international agreements about children's rights, where every country should adhere to (Kinderombudsman, n.d.). Besides, thirty-eight scientists have cooperated to create a research document wherein they describe the damage that children will experience in their development when they are deported to another country. The "Kinderombudsman" agrees on this statement (Scherder, Van Os, Zijlstra, 2018). This research has been conducted in 2018, after the case of Lili and Howick came into public. This could explain the growing interest in children's rights and psychological development in between the cases.

Another frequent form of activism was lobbying. Several influential actors were trying to lobby for, for example, Mauro's residence permit, but also for a more general children's pardon. Political members and individual actors lobbied with submitting motions and contributing to organized demonstrations. The final often used form of activism in the cases, were emergency letters. Several initiators wrote emergency letters to the performing state secretary with the request to use his discretionary power. For example, school directors, mayors, friends and families and NGOs wrote these letters. Emergency letters were used during all cases. One remarkable emergency letter was the one from Mauro to the state secretary. In this letter, he described his life in the Netherlands, how he felt about the situation and his future ambitions (Boon, 2011). However, journalist Thijs Wolters from PowNed found the writing style of this letter remarkable and it appeared that Mauro did not write this letter himself, it was an action from a professional text writer of Defence for Children. Mauro explained this himself in an *Algemeen Dagblad* publication (Boon, 2011).

The case of Lili and Howick had some different forms of protest activities. First, and most interesting, is hiding. Both children were hide by their mother, in order to protect them from deportation. The police asked citizens to watch out for the children, and if someone found them, these persons should report the children to the police. However, a lot of people did not appreciate this request. On social media, Lili and Howick became trending topic with the hashtag "#ikwerknietmee"

and people were offering their shelter if needed and compared the police's request with the 'razzia' from the Second World War. For example, one Twitter message from article two stated:

"I have a lot of respect for the police and I am always willing to help them, however, in this case I will show my civil disobedience. If I knew where Lili and Howick are hiding, I would not tell the police, but help them to become safe. I would do this, because they belong here".

Also, famous personalities, for example Arthur Japin, showed his indignation in article two and compared the situation with the Battle of Waterloo:

"Historical day. Turning point in Dutch history: police is asking citizens to report children, not to keep them safe, but to deliver them to the unknown. Outrageous. Is Minister President too busy partying to see that this is his political Waterloo?"

This form of activism cannot be found in the other cases. It was a unique and impulsive decision of their mother, since she was shocked by the fact that her children were diagnosed with a post-traumatic stress disorder by neurologist Erik Scherder (Van Kommer, 2018). According to children's rights lawyer Martine Goeman of Defence for Children, the Dutch government is afraid that other families in similar situations will also hide their children when the state secretary is using his discretionary power in Lili and Howick's case (Huisman, 2018).

Another unique form of protest were the ongoing vigils in three churches in Culemborg for the Andropov family. The Andropov family was very committed to the churches in Culemborg, and these churches showed their solidarity and support to the family. One example of a demonstration took place in Culemborg, where:

"almost 200 citizens of Culemborg came together in the church for a manifestation. There were speeches and music, and after the vigil, the group walked singing to the Markt. Participants formed a great circle around torches and left the Markt after two minutes of silence".

Churches and their protests are showing a strong social network of the family in the community. The family received even support in Kiev from an international Christian church, when they arrived at the airport. A new form of protest arises with a "PardonAlert". This PardonAlert is a service which people can sign up for, and every time an illegal asylum child will be deported, people will get an SMS message on their mobile phone. Organizers of PardonAlert are trying to inform as many people about the case, which might indirectly lead to media attention. The reason for operating this service is their dissatisfaction with the current children's pardon (PardonAlert, n.d.). Through this new form of communication, people are faster informed about poignant cases, which makes it also possible to faster receive media attention. This could be related to the social movement theory, since media is able to create collective feelings of compassion and stimulate action in society (Van Zoonen, 2014). Differences that were standing out in between the cases, where that NGOs became more important in supporting the beneficiary's situation. Especially because NGOs mentioned that their support mainly

took place behind closed doors. However, as we can see over time, NGOs were bringing cases to the media, to gain public and political interest. In addition, mayors have become more important in the lobbying process. In order to create a collective form of protest, several municipalities created and joined the so called “children’s pardon municipalities” (kinderpardon gemeenten) (Bakker, 2018). Almost 100 municipalities pleaded for a more generous children’s pardon, and their mayors are actively concerned in poignant cases (ibid.). According to the actor structure of Bader and Probst (2018), the results are not in line with their assumption that an individual actor is mostly the first initiator of a protest activity. As the results have shown, mainly NGOs concerned with the case were the first initiators in organizing protest activities.

### 4.3. Argumentation

In the argumentation analysis, the protest movement used the asylum authenticity discourse, the global injustice discourse, duty of care discourse and the cultural inclusion discourse (Van Gorp, 2005). The main used argument in all four articles is the beneficiary’s cultural inclusion in the Dutch society. Supporters of the beneficiary are presenting the beneficiary as a victim, since they are fully integrated in Dutch society. In addition, supporters have feelings of compassion and ingroup solidarity for the beneficiary. For example, school directors, mayors, friends and family of the beneficiary often emphasize the integration of the beneficiary, their perfect Dutch language, their Dutch social network and their school participation. Besides external actors, the beneficiary is explaining his connection with the Netherlands. For example, Mauro himself stated that “he felt completely Dutch, that he has no relationship with his birth mother and Angola, and that he would like to focus on his future in order to be meaningful for the Dutch society”. A quotation from the mayor of Culemborg, where the Andropov family lived, is one example of the community’s solidarity with the family:

"These are our neighbors, our classmates, our colleagues, our teammates and our friends. They belong with us. The children are born and raised here. Their parents are living in the Netherlands for 17 years and are working on their future in the Netherlands" (Stichting Inlia, 2018).

The beneficiaries from all cases are attending schools in the Netherlands, which is another argument to protect the children from deportation, since the quality of schools in their country of origin are not like the Dutch quality. This is in line with the global injustice discourse (Maussen & Versteegt, 2012). The children will not face prosperous future perspectives in their country of origin. Besides, many actors find it inhuman to deny children from education. This pattern can be found from Mauro’s case on. During his case, the violation of human rights and children’s rights are often named. This in combination with academic research to the psychological consequences for deported children. UNICEF published an article where the organization mentioned violation of human rights for children who have lived more than five years in the Netherlands. UNICEF mentions that “research has shown that children

who have lived more than five years in the Netherlands and go to school in this country are completely integrated and rooted, deportation will harm their psychological development". This is in line with the research of Scherder, Van Os and Zijlstra (2018). According to the asylum authenticity discourse, people will see the beneficiary as a victim when their asylum procedure was too strict, unfair or when their rejection is unfair. In the case of Mauro, opposition claimed that Mauro and the Lili and Howick were intruders, because they lied about their nationality. However, supporters are claiming that Mauro and Lili and Howick are not responsible for actions of their birth parents. In the analyzed articles, the beneficiaries were all seen as victims, therefore, they should not be deported. In the case of Taïda, several supporters claimed that her arrest and imprisonment was inhuman, since being undocumented is not a crime. This presentation of a victim, is also in line with the asylum authenticity discourse.

Finally, the duty of care discourse, where especially municipalities are supporting the beneficiaries. In several articles from Mauro's case and the Andropov case, the mayor of their residential area was supporting the beneficiary. Especially in the Andropov case, since Maksim need extra help for his language development disorder and autism. We can see a pattern, where municipalities disagree on national deportation regulations. For example, the mayor of Culemborg sent an emergency letter to the state secretary, with a request to not deport the Andropov family. The mayor's commitment to the case could be explained by the fact that the municipality is responsible for shelter and care of the beneficiary, and therefore, the mayor is requesting new policies to secure the beneficiary's situation. In conclusion, four themes in the asylum debate according to the results can be distinguished. First, the unfair asylum procedure and unfair imprisonment, according to the asylum authenticity discourse. Second, the unfavorable future perspectives in the country of origin when the beneficiary would be deported, related to the global injustice discourse. Third, because the cases concern children, who are considered vulnerable, the (local) government should provide assistance (Maussen & Versteegt, 2012). This is in line with the duty of care discourse. And finally, the argument of uprooting and psychological damage when children are deported after more than five years. Children who are living more than five years in the Netherlands, and are fully integrated, should not be deported according to the cultural inclusion discourse (Maussen & Versteegt, 2012).

#### **4.4. Policy consequences**

The discussion and debate as well in public as in politics about poignant asylum cases including children has been visible during all the cases. Politicians, media and NGO have discussed about asylum children's general rights and about these individual cases. It started with Taïda's case, where one NGO - DeGoedeZaak - wanted the government to implement a new legislation regards to the children's pardon, where they lobbied for residence permits for almost 400 children who lived almost their entire

life in the Netherlands. The main reason for initiating a children's pardon was that children should not be victims of the everlasting asylum procedures and inefficiency of the government. The first children's pardon was initiated on December 21, 2012 by former state secretary of Safety and Justice, Fred Teeven, as result of the political consensus between the VVD and PvdA (Labor Party). This new children's pardon has been entered into force on January 31, 2013. This new children's pardon can be traced down to Mauro's case, since it is also known as the "Maurowet". Almost 800 children benefited from this pardon by receiving a residence permit. However, in order to benefit from the pardon, children need to meet several criteria. They should have lived at least five years in the Netherlands before his or her eighteenth birthday. The reason for implementing this pardon, according Fred Teeven, is that poignant situations like Mauro's situation should be less discussed in public. Even though a tremendous amount of media attention in the case of Taïda, Lili and Howick, and the Andropov family, actual policy changes cannot be traced down by these individual cases. Only the "Maurowet" can be traced down to an individual case. On the other hand, three letters of parliament can be traced down to children in the asylum debate. The names of the beneficiaries are not mentioned - except for Lili and Howick -, however, state secretary Harbers have abolished the imprisonment of asylum children in 2011 (Rijksoverheid, 2011). Besides, he introduced a new policy of faster and more streamlined asylum procedures. He argued that asylum applications should be evaluated faster, in order to prevent that - especially children - become rooted in society (Rijksoverheid, 2011). This new policy came to light in 2018 again, when the Second Chamber has asked state secretary Harbers, how he would execute this policy and which concrete steps he will take in order to prevent other asylum children like 'Lili and Howick'. His answer was that he is going to designate an independent research commission, to investigate all aspects in individual asylum cases (Rijksoverheid, 2018). All these policy letters can be found in Appendix I.

## 5. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate whether societal activism could influence deportation and/or asylum policies. The four researched cases were exclusively focused on situations where children were involved, and the great amount of media attention each case received. The corresponding research question was:

**To what extent has public activism against the deportation of four poignant asylum cases involving children between 2005 and 2018 changed and how have these activism activities influenced deportation policy in the Netherlands?**

For this research, I conducted a discourse analysis, focused on newspaper articles. The reason for choosing newspaper articles is the fact that it is a stable form of journalism and with a discourse and

analysis, it is possible to investigate how communication has become meaningful and how the content has influenced social reality. Besides, the difference between national and local newspapers has given me the opportunity to investigate what arguments were used, but also which policy changes have taken place.

The first sub question was *what specific forms of activism were used during the four cases*. The results indicate that mainly, but not limited, demonstrations, petitions and emergency letters were used as forms of activism. These forms of activism were seen during all cases; however, also unique forms of activism were seen, such as hiding, marriage proposals and vigils. These forms were unique and limited to one case. These demonstrations, petitions and emergency letters were mainly initiated by family and friends, NGOs, and mayors. This is answering the second sub question, *which actors mainly initiated and contributed activism activities during the four cases?* Here we can also find a pattern, namely that NGOs – especially Defence for Children – are supporting the children in their asylum procedure, but also in their mental support, organizing protest activities and lobbying by higher institutions for policy changes. These NGOs usually want to keep the children on the background, however, in some cases, the NGOs decide in cooperation with the refugee that seeking media attention is the final hope for receiving a residence permit. The involved actors in protest activities did not change over the years and were present in all cases. The third sub question was *what arguments were used during the public discourse of the four cases?* The results of this sub question were based on the four dominant discourses of protest, the authenticity asylum discourse, the global injustice discourse, the duty of care discourse and the cultural inclusion discourse. According to the results, especially cultural integration of the children were the main arguments to protect the children from deportation. Citizens saw the children as part of their ‘group’, and were not satisfied with the asylum procedures, because these procedures could violate the human and children’s rights. To summarize, the asylum children were seen as Dutch citizens, who were fully integrated, went to school in the Netherlands, and therefore, they should not be deported to their country of origin. In addition, according to several academic researchers and NGOs, deportation of young children who lived more than five years in the Netherlands, could extremely harm their psychological development.

The next sub question was *what the immediate consequences of the activism for the individual cases were*. According to these results, there are some differences between the cases. Taïda Pasic has been expelled to Bosnia, where she graduated for her pre-university education. After that, she applied for a temporary residence permit in order to start a university career in the Netherlands. She could stay in the Netherlands on a study visa with financial support from the Van Beek-Donner foundation. The second case, Mauro Manuel, was initially forced to return to Angola. His foster parents tried to adopt him, what eventually was impossible since his birth parents were still alive. However, Mauro also applied for a study visa in December 2011, which he received until September 2012. After that,

he received a permanent residence permit. During Mauro's process, Defence for Children raised attention to the psychological harm children will experience when they are deported after five years of living and rooted in the Netherlands. This has been researched by several academics from the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and UNICEF. The third case of Lili and Howick had an interesting end. The children were supposed to leave the Netherlands, however, her mother hid them on a secret safe place with another family, where the children stayed for three days. The state secretary Mark Harbers did not have the intention to use his discretionary power, however, eventually he did. His argument for granting a residence permit for the children was that the government could not guarantee their safety while hiding. The final case of the Andropov had a different outcome. The family lived for seventeen years in the Netherlands and all three children were born in the Netherlands. However, after several attempts to receive a residence permit, the family has been forced to return.

The final sub question in order to answer the main research question was *which wider general deportation policy changes can be traced back to these individual cases*. It can be concluded from the results that all cases had some influence on the asylum and deportation debate in the Second Chamber. This issue has always been on the agenda; however, explicit decisions were never made. Until Mauro's case, when two members of parliament, Diederik Samson (PvdA) and Joël Voordewind (ChristenUnie), tabled a legislative proposal for the right of residence for children who are, like Mauro, rooted in the Dutch society. The name of this legislative proposal was 'Maurowet' or 'Wortelingswet'. It can be assumed that these two politicians proposed this law, since their political parties were both supporters for more tolerance to asylum children. As can be seen, all executing state secretaries during the cases were politicians from opposition parties. If these state secretaries were from the supporting parties at that time, outcomes for the children in these cases, but also asylum policy focused on children, could be completely different as it is now. Besides, on 8 March 2012, the children's ombudsman Marc Dullaert initiated the report 'Wachten op je Toekomst' (Waiting for your Future), where he pleaded for an individual and independent evaluation of each child's wellbeing, including psychological damage.

To answer the main research question, protest activism has not extremely changed over the years. However, actors were looking for other forms of protest which are unique for some cases. Obviously, social media has become more important in communicating regards to the case, in organizing activities and to recruit people for signing a petition. People were also more able to show their solidarity or give their opinion on social media. The protest activities did have some influence on deportation policy; however, these cases were unique whereby the state secretary felt pressure from the society to use his discretionary power for one case. With this power, he was not able to help all similar cases who did not reach the media. This media attention could influence policy, since it is



continuously addressed by the public, which reaches to the Second Chamber. This eventually led to a new law for asylum children, the 'Maurowet' and changes in children's imprisonment, and more efficient asylum procedures. Even though each state secretary does not admit that his or her final decision has been influenced by the public, the societal pressure could definitely influence policy making.

## 6. Discussion

In this section, I will discuss several recommendations for the problem statement and suggestions for future research will be made.

This study has demonstrated that several actors are trying to convince the state secretary to use his or her discretionary power in order to protect the beneficiary from deportation. Emergency letters and media attention are pressuring the state secretary, where actors are anticipating on his or her personality and humanity. Therefore, I would recommend abolishing the discretionary power and replace the responsibility of deportation decisions from the political area to another independent institution, such as the IND.

Furthermore, changes in asylum policy procedures could protect the children from becoming rooted in the Dutch society. When procedures are executed faster and more efficient, children are less able to root and integrate in the Netherlands, which will lead to less psychological damage when they are eventually deported. A possible solution for this procedure is evaluating each case involving children independently, and when decisions are negative, forced return should be facilitated as soon as possible.

Finally, especially for policy makers and politicians, it is important to try to keep a case out of the media. When cases have reached the media and the public, it can be stated that, according to these results, the state secretary's and the parliament's position is under pressure. NGOs are extremely aware of the power of the media, and they will always try to organize demonstrations and gain media attention in achieving their goals. According to the results, it appeared that not the beneficiary himself is trying to gain media attention, most of the time NGOs will gain media attention in favor of the beneficiary.

## Reference list

Bader, D., & Probst, J. (2018). Saving the deportee: Actors and strategies of anti-deportation protests in Switzerland. In S. Rosenberger, V. Stern, & N. Merhaut (Eds.), *Protest movements in asylum and deportation* (pp. 141–160). New York: Springer

- Bakker, R. (2018). *100 gemeenteraden voor 'humaan kinderpardon'*. Retrieved 16 June, 2019 via the Telegraaf web site: <https://www.telegraaf.nl/nieuws/2807873/100-gemeenteraden-voor-humaan-kinderpardon>
- BNN VARA. (2011). Mauro moet terug naar Angola. Retrieved 15 May, 2019 via de BNN VARA web site: <https://joop.bnnvara.nl/nieuws/mauro-moet-terug-naar-angola>
- Boon, L. (2011). Wie schreef de brief van Mauro? Een reconstructie. Retrieved 12 June, 2019 via the NRC website: <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2011/11/01/wie-schreef-de-brief-van-mauro-een-reconstructie-a1451147>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, W. K., and Hackett, R. A. (2006). Democratic media activism through the lens of social movement theory. *Media, Culture & Society* 28(1), 83-104. DOI: 10.1177/0163443706059289
- Cohen, J. L. (1985). Strategy or identity: new theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements. *Social research* 52(4), 663-716.
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding Process Tracing. *Political Sciences and Politics* 44(4), 823-830.
- Defence for Children. (2019). *Akkoord over kinderpardon*. Retrieved on 3 April 2019 via the Defence For Children website: <https://www.defenceforchildren.nl/actueel/nieuws/migratie/2019/akkoord-over-kinderpardon>
- De la Porta, D., and Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: an introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Diaz Romero, L. (2014). On the Web and Contemporary Social Movements. In B. Patrut, and M. Patrut (Eds.), *Social Media in Politics, Public Administration and Information Technology* 13 (pp. 19 - 33). New York: Springer
- Earl, J. (2006). Pursuing Social Change Online The Use of Four Protest Tactics on the Internet. *Social Science Computer Review* 24(3), 362-377.

Freeman, J., and Johnson, V. (1999). *Waves of protest: social movements since the sixties*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Geen Kind Aan De Kant. (2019). Oekraïens gezin gearresteerd. Retrieved on 15 May, 2019 from:  
<https://geenkindaandekant.nl/2018/07/02/oekraiens-gezin-gearresteerd/>

Hwang, S. (2008). Utilizing Qualitative Data Analysis Software A Review of Atlas.ti. *Social Science Computer Review* 26(4), 519-527.

Jacobs, D., and Tillie, J. (2004). Introduction: Social Capital and Political Integration of Migrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(3), 419-427.

Kos, S., Maussen, M., and Doomernik, J. (2015). Policies of Exclusion and Practices of Inclusion: How Municipal Governments Negotiate Asylum Policies in the Netherlands. *Territory, Politics, Governance*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2015.1024719>

Melucci, A. (1995). The process of collective identity. In H. Jonhston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture* (pp. 41-63). Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Michielsen, P. (2006). *Terug naar een apartheidsstaat*. Retrieved 11 June, 2019 via the nrc.nl website:  
<https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2006/03/02/terug-naar-een-apartheidsstaat-11090769-a1225958>

Nederlandse Omroep Stichting. (2018). *Angst voor veiligheid verdwenen Lili en Howick gaf doorslag*. Retrieved on 16 March, 2019, via the NOS website:  
<https://nos.nl/artikel/2249528-angst-voor-veiligheid-verdwenen-lili-en-howick-gafdoorslag.html>

Neumayer, C., and Svensson, J. (2016). Activism and radical politics in the digital age: Towards a typology. Convergence: *The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 22(2), 131-146.

Nu.nl. (2019). Lili en Howick mogen toch in Nederland blijven, kinderen weer terecht.

Retrieved on 2 April, 2019, via the NU.nl website: <https://www.nu.nl/binnenland/5453123/lili-en-howick-mogen-toch-in-nederland-blijven-kinderen-weer-terecht.html>

PardonAlert. (n.d.). Breng het verjagen van asielkinderen aan het licht! Retrieved on 7 June, 2019, via the PardonAlert web site: <https://pardonalert.nl/>

Phillips, N., and Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction. Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage

Reis, R., Van Der Geest, S., and Gerrits, T. (2008). Over kwalitatieve analyse bij onderzoek onder 'anderen'. In M. Foets, J. Schuster & K. Stronks (Ed.), *Gezondheids(zorg)onderzoek onder allochtone bevolkingsgroepen* (pp. 108 - 121). Amsterdam: Aksant

Rijksoverheid. (2011). *Kamerbrief Beleidsvisie stroomlijning toelatingsprocedures*. Retrieved 16 June, 2019 via the Rijksoverheid web site:  
<https://archieff06.archiefweb.eu/archives/archiefweb/20180418062818/https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/terugkeer-vreemdelingen/documenten/kamerstukken/2011/02/22/kamerbrief-beleidsvisie-stroomlijning-toelatingsprocedures>

Rijksoverheid. (2011). *Kamerbrief Beperking detentie alleenstaande minderjarige vreemdelingen*. Retrieved 16 June, 2019 via the Rijksoverheid web site:  
<https://archieff06.archiefweb.eu/archives/archiefweb/20180418062818/https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/terugkeer-vreemdelingen/documenten/kamerstukken/2011/03/10/kamerbrief-beperking-detentie-alleenstaande-minderjarige-vreemdelingen>

Rijksoverheid. (2018). Beantwoording Kamervragen over de asielindustrie. Retrieved 16 June, 2019 via the Rijksoverheid web site:  
<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2018/10/22/antwoorden-kamervragen-over-de-asielindustrie>

- Rosenberger, S. (2014). Political Protest in Asylum and Deportation. An Introduction. In B. Patrut, and M. Patrut (Eds.), *Social Media in Politics, Public Administration and Information Technology 13* (pp. 19 - 33). New York: Springer
- Rosenberger, S., and Winkler, J. (2014). Com/passionate Protests: Fighting the Deportation of Asylum Seekers. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 19(2), 165-184.
- Scherder, E., Van Os, C., Zijlstra, E. (2018). *Schaderisico bij uitzetting langdurig verblijvende kinderen*. Een multidisciplinaire wetenschappelijke onderbouwing. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Retrieved 16 May, 2019 via the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen database.
- Stichting Inlia. (2018). Gezin met in Nederland geboren kinderen na 17 jaar uitgezet. Retrieved 16 May, 2019 via the Stichting Inlia website: <https://www.inlia.nl/nl/nieuws/920/gezin-met-in-nederland-geboren-kinderen-na-17-jaar-uitgezet>
- Swerts, T. (2015). Gaining a Voice: Storytelling and Undocumented Youth Activism in Chicago. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 20(3), 345-360. DOI: 10.17813/1086-671X-20-3-345
- Turpijn, L., Kneefel, S., and Van der Veer, N. (2015). *Nationale social media onderzoek 2015*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Newcom Research & Consultancy
- Van den Dool, P. (2013). Mauro heft een verblijfsvergunning en mag definitief in Nederland blijven. Verkregen op 16 maart, 2019 via de NRC website: <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2013/03/30/mauro-heeft-verblijfsvergunning-en-magdefinitief-in-nederland-blijven-a1435999>
- Van Gorp, B. (2005). Where is the Frame? Victims and Intruders in the Belgian Press Coverage of the Asylum Issue. *European Journal of Communication* 20(4), 484 - 507. DOI: 10.1177/0267323105058253
- Van Stekelenburg, J., and Klandermans, B. (2013). The social psychology of protest. *Current Sociology Review* 61(5-6), 886 - 905. DOI: 10.1177/0011392113479314
- Van Zoonen, L. (2014). *Media, Cultuur & Burgerschap. Een inleiding* (3rd ed.). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Het Spinhuis.

Versteegt, I., and Maussen, M. (2012). Contested policies of exclusion in The Netherlands: The lamentable asylum cases of Sahar and Mauro. *European University Institute*.

Weldon, S. L. (2011). *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*. University of Michigan Press.

## Appendix

Appendix I: parliamentary letters and policy documents regards to policy changes in the asylum debate

- Letter to the chairman of the Second Chamber from 22 February, 2011, 5685770/11 - subject  
Beleidsvisie stroomlijning toelatingsprocedures
- Letter to the chairman of the Second Chamber from 10 March, 2011, 5687612/11 - subject  
Beperking detentie alleenstaande minderjarige vreemdelingen
- Kamerstukken II 2011-2012, 33068 nr. 3 subject 'Maurowet'
- Letter to the chairmen of the Second Chamber from 22 October, 2018, 2365940 - subject  
Antwoorden Kamervragen over de asielindustrie

## CHECKLIST ETHICAL AND PRIVACY ASPECTS OF RESEARCH

### INSTRUCTION

This checklist should be completed for every research study that is conducted at the Department of Public Administration and Sociology (DPAS). This checklist should be completed *before* commencing with data collection or approaching participants. Students can complete this checklist with help of their supervisor.

This checklist is a mandatory part of the empirical master's thesis and has to be uploaded along with the research proposal.

The guideline for ethical aspects of research of the Dutch Sociological Association (NSV) can be found on their website ([http://www.nsv-sociologie.nl/?page\\_id=17](http://www.nsv-sociologie.nl/?page_id=17)). If you have doubts about ethical or privacy aspects of your research study, discuss and resolve the matter with your EUR supervisor. If needed and if advised to do so by your supervisor, you can also consult Dr. Jennifer A. Holland, coordinator of the Sociology Master's Thesis program.

### PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Project title: The Diversity and Morphology of Deportation Regimes

Name, email of student: Suzanne Wevers, 485605sw@eur.nl

Name, email of supervisor: Marieke van Houte, vanhoute@essb.eur.nl

Start date and duration: December 2018 - 20 June 2019

Is the research study conducted within DPAS

☒ YES ☐ NO

If 'NO': at or for what institute or organization will the study be conducted?  
(e.g. internship organization)

### PART II: TYPE OF RESEARCH STUDY

Please indicate the type of research study by circling the appropriate answer:

1. Research involving human participants.

YES ☒ NO



If 'YES': does the study involve medical or physical research?

YES ☐ NO ☒

Research that falls under the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act ([WMO](#)) must first be submitted to [an accredited medical research ethics committee](#) or the Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects ([CCMO](#)).

2. Field observations without manipulations that will not involve identification of participants.

YES ☐ NO ☒

3. Research involving completely anonymous data files (secondary data that has been anonymized by someone else).

YES ☐ NO ☒

### PART III: PARTICIPANTS - does not apply to my research

(Complete this section only if your study involves human participants)

Where will you collect your data?

---

---

*Note: indicate for separate data sources.*

What is the (anticipated) size of your sample?

---

---

*Note: indicate for separate data sources.*

What is the size of the population from which you will sample?

---

---

*Note: indicate for separate data sources.*

1. Will information about the nature of the study and about what participants can expect during the study be withheld from them?

YES ☐ NO ☒

2. Will any of the participants not be asked for verbal or written 'informed consent,' whereby they agree to participate in the study?

YES ☐ NO ☒

3. Will information about the possibility to discontinue the participation at any time be withheld from participants?

YES ☐ NO ☒

4. Will the study involve actively deceiving the participants?

YES ☐ NO ☒

*Note: almost all research studies involve some kind of deception of participants. Try to think about what types of deception are ethical or non-ethical (e.g. purpose of the study is not told, coercion is exerted on participants, giving participants the feeling that they harm other people by making certain decisions, etc.).*

5. Does the study involve the risk of causing psychological stress or negative emotions beyond those normally encountered by participants? YES ☒ NO
6. Will information be collected about special categories of data, as defined by the GDPR (e.g. racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade union membership, genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a person, data concerning mental or physical health, data concerning a person's sex life or sexual orientation)? YES ☒ NO
7. Will the study involve the participation of minors (<18 years old) or other groups that cannot give consent? YES ☒ NO
8. Is the health and/or safety of participants at risk during the study? YES ☒ NO
9. Can participants be identified by the study results or can the confidentiality of the participants' identity not be ensured? YES ☒ NO
10. Are there any other possible ethical issues with regard to this study? YES ☒ NO

If you have answered 'YES' to any of the previous questions, please indicate below why this issue is unavoidable in this study.

---

---

---

---

What safeguards are taken to relieve possible adverse consequences of these issues (e.g., informing participants about the study afterwards, extra safety regulations, etc.).

---

---

---

---

Are there any unintended circumstances in the study that can cause harm or have negative (emotional) consequences to the participants? Indicate what possible circumstances this could be.

---

---

---

---

Please attach your informed consent form in Appendix I, if applicable.

25/09/2020  
11:08:50

#### Part IV: Data storage and backup

Where and when will you store your data in the short term, after acquisition?

**I will store my data on my private computer, organizing the data will be done by Excel and Atlas.ti. All literature will be stored in a separate Word document and in Google Drive, in order to have a back-up.**

*Note: indicate for separate data sources, for instance for paper-and pencil test data, and for digital data files.*

Who is responsible for the immediate day-to-day management, storage and backup of the data arising from your research?

**I am responsible for data storage, management and backups.**

How (frequently) will you back-up your research data for short-term data security?

**Every time I have collected new data.**

In case of collecting personal data how will you anonymize the data?

**I will not collect personal data.**

*Note: It is advisable to keep directly identifying personal details separated from the rest of the data. Personal details are then replaced by a key/ code. Only the code is part of the database with data and the list of respondents/research subjects is kept separate.*

#### PART VI: SIGNATURE

Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the ethical guidelines in the conduct of your study. This includes providing information to participants about the study and ensuring confidentiality in storage and use of personal data. Treat participants respectfully, be on time at appointments, call participants when they have signed up for your study and fulfil promises made to participants.

Furthermore, it is your responsibility that data are authentic, of high quality and properly stored. The principle is always that the supervisor (or strictly speaking the Erasmus University Rotterdam) remains owner of the data, and that the student should therefore hand over all data to the supervisor.

Hereby I declare that the study will be conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Department of Public Administration and Sociology at Erasmus University Rotterdam. I have answered the questions truthfully.

Name student: Suzanne Wevers

Name (EUR) supervisor:

Date: 17/03/2019

Date:

