EU Externalization of Migration and Border Management in Serbia:

The Involvement and Impact of NGOs

ERASMUS UNIVERSITEIT ROTTERDAM

Master Thesis

Student: Nevena Vračar (579760)

Thesis Supervisor: dr. Arjen Leerkes

Second Reader: dr. Godfried Engbersen

Master of Science, Sociology

Track: Governance of Migration and Diversity

Erasmus School of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Word count: 9799

Table of Contents

Abstract

This qualitative study maps relevant actors and explores their role in Serbia's migration management system. The research's main focus is put on the role and impact of the non-government sector. The study employs a qualitative, explorative design and utilizes an institutional logics' lens, which positions and explains actor motivation and agency within a particular institutional framework. Additionally, this framework helps describe mutual relationships between different actors. The study evaluates local presence of foreign actors, a consequence of EU externalization of migration and border management, as a complex factor that, combined with selective institutional state response to irregular migration flows, uniquely shapes institutional logics of the civil sector, as well as their application. The study contributes to expanding the knowledge of civil society response to irregular migration in third countries by shedding light on compelling institutional dynamics. Finally, the author discusses a number of implications which may form base for future research.

Key words: externalization, institutional logics, migration management, Serbia

I. Introduction

The Western Balkans are labelled as strategically important in EU externalization policies. During the 'summer of migration' in 2015, their role in managing irregular migration became crucial (Carlucci, 2020, p. 1; Stojić Mitrović & Vilenica, 2019, p. 540). During the past two decades, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, and Serbia have all been targets of trade deals and readmission agreements, which are meant to enhance mutual cooperation and benefit both the EU and Balkan countries. Over the past fifteen years, Western Balkan countries have undergone numerous societal, economic, and institutional reforms as a result of these agreements, mainly in order to become eligible for EU membership (Carlucci, 2020, p. 2).

EU externalization in the Western Balkans aims to influence local and national migration management, as well as to outsource border control. At first, the strategy of contracting surrounding states to 'protect' the EU from unwanted migration was not directly articulated due to fear of colonial and elitist debates. However, it has become more prominently included in developmental projects, trade treaties, security deals, and other bilateral agreements with third countries (Stojić Mitrović & Vilenica, 2019, p. 543). This is part of a larger trend in nuancing approaches to migration and border management. While entry and integration policies have become less restrictive overall, EU states have introduced stricter policies on border control, as well as more intricate remote control policies. Additionally, policy approaches have developed divergently across migrant categories. Consequently, high-skilled workers and students face fewer restrictions in a fairly lenient policy environment, while admission and integration policies for irregular and family migrants have tightened (De Haas, Natter & Vezzoli, 2016, p. 1). For refugees, admission criteria and subsidiary protection remain stable, although their rights have been reduced through restrictions on admission and remote management of irregular migration.

Outsourcing is generally meant to curb irregular migration headed towards the European Union. Migration management in third countries is meant to be comprehensive, focused on protection, resilience, and human rights, to support EU security and to be able to adequately identify, register, and return migrants who are not deemed eligible for asylum in Europe (Carlucci, 2020, p. 4). In doing this, the EU has *de facto* allowed for the establishment of buffer zones at its doorstep, where third countries serve as a filter for EU border control (ibid). Serbia, for instance, which in the past had its asylum system mainly managed by the UNHCR, has implemented an independent asylum system modeled after EU recommendations and requirements. In turn, the EU placed Serbia on the so-called white Schengen list, which relieved Serbian citizens of visa requirements to enter the EU (Mitrović, 2014, p. 1113). Consequently, Serbia can now be considered a safe third country. In other words, Serbia became internationally recognized as a country that can grant asylum (Mitrović, 2014, p. 1114).

Legislation implemented in cooperation with the European Union foresaw adequate border procedures and asylum practices. However, the accompanying measures that would provide appropriate infrastructure and resource capacity to support an asylum system were found to be either lacking or insufficiently effective (Grupković, Kojić & Petronijević, 2016, p. 14). Moreover, some authors claim that countries in the Western Balkans are structurally unable to absorb migration flows and that being tasked with such responsibilities by the EU creates inter-state tensions that ultimately undermine the region's stability (Liperi, 2019, p. 1).

In countries such as Serbia, where governments are hesitant to implement a comprehensive, rights-based approach to immigration, the role of civil society becomes increasingly relevant (Castles, 2004, p. 869). Non-government organizations employ different institutional logics to local and national governments and define multi-level governance problems in their own terms (Scholten, 2013, p. 219; Thorton,

Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 108). They generally follow a community-oriented institutional logic grounded in humanitarianism, commitment to community and rights-based values, cooperation and group membership (ibid). However, in Serbia, civil society organizations were also seen to increase and expand the scope of their activities to compensate for lacking state response (Stojić Mitrović & Vilenica, 2019, p. 547). Moreover, NGOs' established presence within a wider democracy assistance frame allows for utilization of their comparative advantages in their localized and flexible approaches to remedying societal issues (Vetta, 2009, p. 27).

The expanding presence of EU border management externalization, coupled with fragmentary state response and the self-image of a transit country create a dynamic that contributes to the deterioration of state migration management capacities and fuels anti-migrant sentiments in the region (Carlucci, 2020, p. 4). In this study, I seek to map relevant actors and their influence in the migration management system and to investigate how NGOs manage, and potentially ameliorate the outcomes of the aforementioned state institutional dynamics. I recognize the context-specific embeddedness of NGOs in the societal and political context of Serbia, and I focus on how they shape and apply institutional logics within this context.

This study contributes to developing a better understanding of varying structural response and migration management systems within states, as well as to how state and non-state structures codetermine migration outcomes. More precisely, it explores how selective alignment between state institutional structures, which leads to incoherent and incomprehensive migration management, is mitigated through remodeling institutional logics of the civil society. It also describes the effects of external actors' influence on migration management in third countries. Additionally, examining the effects of outsourced border management on the Western Balkan states and the involvement of non-government organizations in mitigating lacking

institutional structures from a sociological, institutionalist perspective, remains largely absent in academic literature.

II.   Research Question & Sub-questions

For the purposes of this thesis project, I have formulated the following research question: *"How, and with what outcomes, are NGO professionals in Serbia applying and shaping their institutional logics amid growing EU externalization efforts and anti-immigration sentiments among the Serbian population?"* In other words, I aim to explore how deficient institutional state structure and a general absence of comprehensive state support in the field of migration management has influenced NGO professionals and their work. Additionally, I looked at how their motivation may have changed due to the external pressure put on Serbia to manage migration within and at its borders. The main research question is supported by the following sub-questions:

a) *What migration management activities are carried out by state and non-state actors?*

b) *How are these financed and what are the implications of different financing schemes?*

c) *How do different state and non-state actors' institutional logics shape NGO activities and outcomes?*

d) *According to NGO professionals, what is the impact of these activities?*

The sub-questions are meant to give a broader description of the institutional composition and to help map relevant actors and their mutual relationships, in order to better understand how non-government organizations act within this system. The focus of this study are local, non-profit, human rights-oriented non-government organizations that are involved in the migration management system. More specifically, I look at non-government organizations that are focused on forced or irregular migration through and towards Serbia.

III.   Theoretical framework

a. *Determinants and Factors in Outsourced Migration Management & Transit Migration*

Ineffective migration management and failure to reach declared objectives in policy making, which result in weak institutional structures regarding migration management, can be attributed to three main factors: factors arising from social dynamics of migratory processes, factors relating to transnationalism and globalization, and factors within political systems (Castles, 2004, p. 852). Castles questions whether democratic states possess the capacity to predict long-term consequences of their policies, whether there is consensus on what the long-term goals should be, and whether the policy tools used to achieve long-term goals are consistent with laws in democratic countries (Castles, 2004, p. 856). He also notes that what is deemed as policy 'failure' or unintended consequences in crafting and implementing migration policies may be a misleading term, as policymakers and politicians do not always find it useful to declare true motives behind migration policies due to fear of resistance and opposition. Therefore, success and failure of policy arrangements lies in the eye of the beholder (Castles, 2004, p. 854).

In Serbia, policy objectives and state response to irregular migration were grouped in three prominent discursive frames. Discursive frames were used to justify changes in management and reception practices. Notably, these shifts were not necessarily made for the purpose of efficacy, but are rather connected to (geo)political developments in the region (Stojić Mitrović, 2018, p. 17). The first phase, which lasted roughly until 2014, was marked by a general absence of irregular migrants in the media and public discourse, by a civil sector whose main focus were internally displaced asylum seekers from the 1990s, and by a moderate, but established presence of external actors. In 2015, when transit migration through Serbia rose rapidly, migration was framed as a

humanitarian crisis, which in turn triggered an emergency response. In 2016, with the closure of the Balkan corridor through Serbia, the state adopted a securitarian framework focused on border protection and durable solutions for irregular migrants and asylum seekers (Stojić Mitrović, 2018, p. 20). By this time, external actors had an active and established presence in Serbia's migration management systems, and local non-government organizations were compelled to support state action.

Within political systems, civil society plays an important role in campaigning against discrimination and racism, as well as aid interventions. Civil society organizations, such as NGOs, are also exceedingly important in countries where political systems are not resolute to grant rights to migrants (Castles, 2004, p. 869). Moreover, it is subject to questioning whether ineffective state policies are intentionally compelling the civil sector to act in order to mediate their impact. More generally, civil society organizations are found to be more flexible than the state and able to act more locally, which emphasizes their value as an established presence in a wider democracy assistance framework (Vetta, 2009, p. 27).

Clandestine migration flows headed towards the European Union, which involve substantial transit migration have been problematized because migrants who make use of transit routes through third countries for the most part do not qualify for regular entry (Düvell, Molodikova & Collyer, 2014, p. 211). Countries positioned en route from origin countries to the European Union have generally been divided into five categories, based on whether they experience a significant or a relative amount of emigration, immigration, and transit migration (ibid). Transit countries are stops along clandestine migration routes that are not explicitly labeled as destination countries for these migrants. However, due to their continuous presence and targeted EU externalization, they are required to comply with the growingly illiberal international arrangements on transit movements (Düvell, Molodikova & Collyer, 2014, p. 213). Consequently, transit countries are progressively transformed into

countries of enforced stay. Following this theory, Serbia may be categorized as a largely sending country with relatively significant levels of transit migration.

However, research shows that transit countries where immigration restrictions hinder further migration and legal residence, there is a strong incentive for migrants to remain irregularly and engage in the shadow economy (Düvell, Collyer & Molodikova, 2014, p. 214). Furthermore, transit migration can be caused by a lack of legal or economic opportunities in the first or second country of arrival. Additionally, unwelcoming environments characterized by racism, discrimination, and police violence, coupled with inefficient asylum systems have been observed to prompt further transit migration, as opposed to settlement or return (Düvell, Collyer & Molodikova, 2014, p. 216).

Following a discussion on fragmentary state response to irregular migration and deficient institutional structures in Serbia's migration management system, as well as the aforementioned destabilizing effect that might contribute to anti-migrant sentiments, whether Serbia could effectively be transformed into a buffer zone through EU externalization policies may be subject of debate. Many local NGOs in Serbia expressed serious concerns towards adopting a securitarian discourse, due to the possibility of it leading to avoidance of responsibilities stemming from humanitarian law (Stojić Mitrović, 2019, p. 21). Reports assert that the Serbian asylum procedure, which was found to be slow and ineffective, may have a strong negative influence on the migrants' decision and legal opportunity to remain the country, and thereby prompt further transit migration.

Wissink, Düvell and van Eerdewijk describe how different socio-institutional environments impact transit migration. Their study reveals that informal local and transnational social networks of migrants matter most in shaping migration intentions in a transit context alongside the transit country's institutional context (which refers to its migration policy and NGO support) (2013, p. 1093). Furthermore, weak

institutional context was found to contribute to clandestine migration or illegal stay (Wissink, Düvell & van Eerdewijk, 2013, p. 1100). Moreover, NGOs were found to be crucial in strategizing migration pathways because they are more likely to receive updated information of Refugee Status Determination (RSD), and are able to intervene more quickly and effectively in cases of unlawful detention and deportation (Wissink, Düvell & van Eerdewijk, 2013, p. 1101). They provide aid and ameliorate the position of migrants, enabling them to await asylum decisions or strategize further migration (ibid).

Through this framework, we observe a number of seminal points that better contextualize the dynamics within migration systems in transit countries. Firstly, migration policies may have dubious intentions and produce divergent outcomes. Secondly, weak institutional contexts play a large role in transit migration. Lastly, civil society, and in particular non-government organizations have a substantial potential to facilitate negative outcomes because of their flexibility, local orientation, and international connections (Vetta, 2009, p. 27).

b. *Institutional Logics Perspective & Multi-level Governance*

Institutional logics are defined as "socially constructed sets of material practices, assumptions, values, and beliefs that shape cognition and behavior" (Besharov & Smith, 2014, p. 364). The institutional logics perspective is construed as a metatheoretical framework for analyzing interrelationships between institutions, individuals, and organizations in social systems (Thorton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 2). Engagement with institutional logics helps to better understand the principles, practices, and symbols intrinsic to different institutional orders, spanning a multitude of social locations, such as the family, market, state, religion, and others (ibid). Institutional logics guide social action and help explain its variation (or lack thereof)

in use of available forms and practices amongst different institutions (Greenwood et al., 2010, p. 521). Based on what are considered to be core institutions in society, authors have developed seven ideal types of institutional logics: family, community, religion, state, market, profession, and corporation (Thorton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 73). While institutions operating under the logic of community are committed to group membership, belief in trust and reciprocity, emotional connection, values of sharing and community, the state mainly acts as a redistribution mechanism founded in democratic participation and aimed at continuous bureaucratic domination. In Serbia's migration management system, the non-governmental sector has increased activities through various programs related to migration. These activities range from humanitarian to educational, which points to a possible expansion and hybridization of logics in this sector (Stojić Mitrović & Vilenica, 2019, p. 547). Based on previously discussed literature, I have selected three institutional logics deemed relevant in this research. These are state, community, and profession. While the presence of state and community logics may be regarded as self-evident, an additional profession logic was included to see how the civil sector behaves as a potentially institutionalized part of the migration management system.

Relevant institutional logics (Thorton et al., 2012, p. 73):

Categories	Community	State	Profession
Root Metaphor	Common Boundary	State as redistribution mechanism	Professional relational network
Sources of Legitimacy	Unity of will; Belief in trust & reciprocity	Democratic participation	Personal expertise
Sources of Authority	Commitment to community values & ideology	Bureaucratic domination	Professional association
Sources of Identity	Emotional connection, ego-satisfaction & reputation	Social & economic class	Association with quality of craft; persona reputation
Basis of Norms	Group membership	Citizenship in nation	Membership in guild & association
Basis of Attention	Personal investment in group	Status of interest group	Status in profession
Basis of Strategy	Increase status & honor of members & practices	Increase community good	Increase personal reputation
Informal Control Mechanisms	Visibility of actions	Backroom politics	Celebrity professionals
Economic System	Cooperative capitalism	Welfare capitalism	Personal capitalism

The institutional logic of liberal states is generally founded in four main imperatives: security provision, economic accumulation, redistribution of wealth within the state, and promoting institutional legitimacy through the rule of law (Leerkes & Van Houte, 2020, p. 321). Following community logic, societal groups may mobilize in order to claim freedom from state authoritarianism, or to redistribute sources amongst citizens in a more equal way, if these are found to disproportionally disadvantage certain groups (Boswell, 2007, p. 80). On the other hand, governments and bureaucracies have scarce interest in adopting external values and norms that go against their imperatives. However, migration policies bring out conflicting demands in states, as two of their main imperatives are at odds, namely those of economic accumulation and ensuring institutional legitimacy. The former is focused on circulation of labor internationally in order to produce more profit, while the latter focuses on ensuring institutional legitimacy through careful allocation of rights (ibid). These have been seen as difficult to realize simultaneously.

Furthermore, in migration governance, authors emphasize the importance of framing in interpretation and perceptions of potential problems. Problems may be recognized on one level of governance, but not on another. They may also be defined in entirely different terms in different levels of governance. A second factor that shapes framing is the political agenda present in all levels of governance, and determined by the political balance of power or institutionalized selection principles in prioritization (Scholten, 2013, p. 219). The intricacies of multi-level governance in the field of migration also stem from the fact that multi-level governance systems are made up of institutions following different institutional logics, which give different levels of priority to different issues and use varying frameworks to approach them. In this vein, non-government organizations sometimes function as liminal service providers, implicitly detesting national policies, yet being silently tolerated by national actors. Moreover, non-government actors are often indirectly funded or provided facilitation for their work. NGO agency allows states to retain the principle of national

sovereignty, while ameliorating the position of vulnerable groups who fall outside of state protection (Ambrosini & Van de Leun, 2015, p. 106). In other words, non-government organizations allow governments to exhibit a rhetoric of closure without having to face the inhumane consequences of such policies (Ambrosini & Van de Leun, 2015, p. 111).

These factors are also intertwined with specific state contexts. In Serbia, Vetta (2009) found that democratization that took place in Serbia during the transition period from a socialist to a democratic regime constructed its own specific local social realities. During the transition period, non-government organizations in Serbia were largely funded by international organizations and foreign donors, in order to help create a 'vibrant civil society' and embed democratic practices into Serbian society (Vetta, 2009, p. 45). The majority of these employees were highly educated academics and experts in their respective fields. However, NGOs were found not to be politically neutral, but rather they are embedded in existing political structures that spanned both regimes. Due to foreign investment in the Serbian NGO sector, local actors were able to generate more agency that suited their own political agendas, aside from the donors'. Many of the NGO professionals that participated in the democratization processes later went on to work for state institutions (Vetta, 2009, p. 32).

On the other hand, the national government has been seen to use NGO presence in public discourse to appeal to foreign investment, by having government officials start their own NGOs for instance, and then publicly criticizing the very same organizations when it becomes apparent that public institutions, nor civil society impact have improved (Vetta, 2009, pp. 34-35). In other words, Vetta's research suggests that NGOs in Serbia do not only facilitate implementing poverty-reducing humanitarian projects in society through foreign investment, but they ultimately absolve the state from ever developing the will, capacities and motivation for real long-term engagement with these issues (2009, p. 39).

IV.   Methodology

a. Research Design, Operationalization & Data Analysis

The study employs a qualitative, exploratory research design. The aim is to map relevant actors and their activities in the field of migration management in Serbia, as well as to identify how institutional logics are formulated and applied in the civil sector. Finally, the study aims to describe the impact of civil sector engagement with the migrant population within a context-specific institutional setup. The study focuses on examining the civil sector in Serbia as a critical instance, with no interest in generalizability, nor with the intention of challenging a highly generalized universal assertion. Main respondents are NGO professionals, as previous research implies their unique position within the institutional context, piques interest of the researcher and therefore deserves closer attention.

The research is based on two main methods: semi-structured interviews and content analysis. Content analysis is meant to provide an overview of the main system structures and their function. The aim of providing a broader institutional context is to better understand the contextual embeddedness of NGOs and better contextualize and explain their rationale and impact. Semi-structured interviews allow the respondents to emphasize the sorts of operationalization of institutional logics that is most relevant in their work. It also allows the researcher to explore different directions in order to determine the presence of different logics. Furthermore, interviewing as a method nuances insights gained through content analysis by providing additional context to specific segments of the system and/or explaining further the origin and intention of institutional setups.

In this study, institutional logics are operationalized as attitudes, norms, assumptions, and activities carried out by state and non-state actors which can be related to one of the previously described ideal types of institutional logics (Thorton et al., 2012, p. 73). In other words, it focuses on the kinds of activities that are carried out, how actors value and give meaning to these activities, how the actors define their importance and impact, how they are motivated to form professional associations, and how they define their purpose. In order to gather this information, the topic list used in interviews focused on the following topics: (1) personal motivation to work for a non-government organization in the field of migration, (2) the motivation and structure of the organization (3) how the respondent's NGO places itself within the system, what kind of activities and programs it runs, their relationships with state and foreign actors, and (4) how their work, as well as the field of migration management in Serbia has changed, or they suspect will change in the future. The state's and foreign actors' roles in the field were largely determined through content analysis and data collected during interviews. Therefore, the assessment of their institutional logics may potentially be limited.

Both interview respondents and documents were sampled through purposive case selection. Additional respondents were contacted using a snowball sampling method, after initial contact with the first respondents had been established. During the initial stages of the research process, a thorough internet search was done in order to identify relevant actors in the field. While this method did not deliver an exhaustive list of non-government organizations, the author was able to identify and make contact with eighteen active organizations. From that sample, members of nine civil society organizations agreed to an interview. I also reached out to one government institution and three foreign organizations, of which only one agreed to an interview. Additionally, using interviews and online search I identified relevant state actors, as well as foreign NGOs and IGOs.

15

Due to travel restrictions that were in place during the fieldwork phase, interviews were conducted via Zoom and Viber. Interviews were conducted in Serbian, and only direct quotes were translated into English by the researcher. In total, eleven interviews were conducted, and later transcribed and analyzed. The sample consists of ten interviews with professionals working for local Serbian NGOs, and one respondent from a foreign-based humanitarian NGO. Respondents varied in regard to their focus and occupation, thereby providing a variety of perspectives. For content analysis, 22 relevant documents were selected. Selection of documents was based on content, and focused mainly on those documents that reported on current happenings and trends, delineating different actors' actions and impact. These would be, for instance, annual field reports on migration management in Serbia, or reports on border, integration, and asylum practices. Reports were sourced online, directly from NGO websites.

Respondents were asked for verbal consent for audio recording at the beginning of each interview. The majority were sent a topic list in advance and all respondents were briefed about the contents of the study. Furthermore, additional steps were taken to ensure respondent privacy remain uninfringed. Respondents' names, as well as NGO names are omitted in order to prevent external, as well as internal identification within organizations. Analysis of collected reports and transcribed interviews was conducted using Atlas.ti and consisted of coding relevant material. Firstly, the material was coded thematically in order to establish a thematic framework that would illuminate the institutional setup and help actor and activity mapping. Subsequently, thematic codes were grouped by actor or relevant aspect and afterwards were deductively linked to ideal-typical definitions of relevant institutional logics, as described in the theoretical framework. The two phases of data analysis allowed the researcher to answer the research question and sub-questions sufficiently.

b. *Participant Profile Summary*

Participant	Participant Job	NGO focus	Main Type of Financing
1	Legal support, Fieldwork, Writing Reports	Human rights & vulnerable groups, all aspects, separate migration & asylum office	UNHCR partner, project financing
2	Capacity building for state actors, policy & legislation analysis	Systemic approach to migration issues: fieldwork & humanitarian assistance, intercultural mediation, policy analysis	Project financing, range of non-dominant actors
3	Social worker, counseling	Developing humanitarian values in society, human rights, educating the public & psychosocial counseling	Project financing, EU & IOM
4	Legal aid	Human rights & vulnerable groups, all aspects, separate migration & asylum office	UNHCR partner, project financing
5	Legal aid	Legal aid, human rights protection	UNHCR & UNICEF partner, project financing
6	Integration assistance	Human rights & vulnerable groups, all aspects, separate migration & asylum office	UNHCR partner, project financing
7	Junior Policy Advisor	Policy Development; social security & inclusion, asylum & migration, human rights & development	UNHCR partner, project financing

		Legal, psychosocial and other support to asylum seekers, refugees and displaced persons; improving overall social climate regarding migration	Independent fund sourcing, financing from non-dominant external actors
8	Legal aid	Legal, psychosocial and other support to asylum seekers, refugees and displaced persons; improving overall social climate regarding migration	Independent fund sourcing, financing from non-dominant external actors
9	Financial manager	Promoting, protecting & educating on human rights; protection of vulnerable groups	UNHCR partner, project financing
10	Project coordinator	Children at risk & children on the move; shelter, education, fieldwork	Project financing, range of non-dominant actors
11	Field Liaison Coordinator	Supporting refugees and displaced people	International humanitarian organization

c. Limitations

The first evident limitation of the chosen methodological approach is the self-reporting of activities and tasks by relevant actors, either in interviews or reports. Due to travel restrictions, the researcher was unable to conduct observation of activities in the field and instead had to rely on second-hand reporting. This limitation was evident in particular when evaluating state effectiveness and its role in the migration management system. Respondent testimonies were incoherent in this regard and often focused on and emphasized entirely different aspects. For example, while some respondents reported that camp management by the state ensures sufficient living conditions and is run relatively smoothly, others were extremely critical about the living conditions and reported over crowdedness and abuse by camp staff. Concerns about varying evaluation of state migration management were further enhanced by quotes from other relevant work on the topic, where respondents expressed concerns about speaking against the state. This was mainly due to fear of being forbidden to

operate inside the camps and to continue their activities. One respondent from the study confesses: *"We cannot criticize how the center is being run because we could be denied entrance then we could not do our job anymore. We cannot speak about the violence in the camps, because we will be pushed out and then no one would be there to protect people during the night."* (Stojić Mitrović & Vilenica, 2019, p. 550). Therefore, state effectiveness in this regard was not explicitly included in the findings.

Secondly, difficulties occurred during actor-mapping, as the size of the civil sector could not be accurately determined. However, an approximate estimation could be made. This limitation is a suspected consequence of project financing and the nature of the civil sector in Serbia. Because organizations are contracted or collaborated with on a project-by-project basis, the number of non-government organizations involved with migrants changes over time. Additionally, many organizations offer their services to multiple marginalized groups, so their focus shifts based on project allocation and field saturation.

Finally, the limitations of this research project do not allow for a full assessment of the presence of religious logics within the system. Although it was not expected, and therefore was not included in the theoretical framework, religious-based organizations in Serbia are present, albeit in a smaller capacity compared to humanitarian non-government organizations. Respondents reported the presence of Christian charity organizations during the peak of the migration surge in 2015/16, when their activities were mainly focused on aid relief, i.e., handing out food and non-food items. Such organizations that do operate in this field generally do not have a Christian Orthodox background. This is at odds with Serbian religious demographic, since roughly 85% of Serbian citizens identify as Christian Orthodox, as per the 2011 census[1]. On the contrary, religious non-government organizations that operate in the

---

[1] https://data.stat.gov.rs/Home/Result/3102010402?languageCode=sr-Latn

field of migration management are identified to be either Catholic, Mormon, or Adventist. While respondents did not see that their religious background plays a large role in constituting their operational logics, it was not possible to determine this with certainty, due to the NGO non-response.

V.   Findings

a. Institutional Context

Migration management in Serbia involves a varied set of state and non-state actors. These can be roughly grouped in three categories: state actors, local civil society, and external actors. External actors include IGOs, NGOs, (embassies of) foreign governments, development agencies, and EU institutions. Migration management covers internal rural to urban migration, support to internally displaced persons and refugees as a result of civil conflict in the 1990s, support in unresolved issues such as citizenship acquisition and property ownership, and irregular migration. Irregular migrants generally come from the Middle East and Asian countries.

From 2010, and especially from 2015 onwards, respondents report an important shift in focus, from humanitarian assistance to more structured and long-term support oriented at durable solutions for irregular migrants and asylum seekers. Shift in activity focus is concurrent with the shift from Serbia as a transit country to buffer zone of enforced stay or return. This converges with discursive shifts described by Stojić Mitrović (2019). Before 2014, irregular transit migration through Serbia was largely absent from the media. Likewise, there was no organized civil society response. This was followed by a phase labeled 'emergency response', in which the support offered to transiting migrants was focused on food and non-food items, and the civil sector was expanded. Following the Balkan route closure in 2016, Serbia

transformed from a transit country to a country of enforced stay and adopted a securitarian approach to irregular migration (Stojić Mitrović, 2019, p. 21). Respondent 9 describes the impact of these discursive shifts:

"They had camps, tents, there were rivers of people, literally. Organizations had their own stalls where they would provide aid. We also had an information center for asylum seekers in the city center. We were located there to provide aid directly to the people. Suddenly, it was simply forbidden, providing aid was perceived as a pull factor, as something that pulls people into the city center [in Belgrade], when they need to be placed in asylum centers and reception centers, because there they should get accommodation, food, healthcare… Then you had a complete change in public policy, they were no longer 'asylum seekers', they were 'migrants', and then you notice how the political situation is aggravating, when they start using the term 'migrant' as a pejorative."

i. The Role of the State and External Actors

While the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration (KIRS) is the key state actor in the system, there are a number of other institutions and ministries that share competencies in this field. KIRS oversees and manages all forms of shelter (mainly camps) that accommodate asylum seekers and irregular migrants. This also includes providing food and healthcare within the camps. KIRS also communicates with the civil sector in order to coordinate the placement of different forms of assistance offered by civil society organizations within camps. Additionally, KIRS collects, compiles, analyzes, and publishes statistical data on irregular and asylum migration. It negotiates reintegration of returnees and proposes programs for return of irregular migrants and support for those who stay in the country. Other relevant state bodies mainly have a monitoring function. Additionally, they may propose policy changes and support strategy implementation. Since the shift to more durable solutions for migrants, other state institutions were involved in the system. This refers to, in

particular, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labor, Employment, Veterans and Social Affairs that have recently been involved mainly in integration strategies.

Intergovernmental organizations' mandates are directly related to migration and focus on governance, the migration-development nexus, and continued or return migration, as well as integration. They aim to support and strengthen different parts of the state system through capacity building, post-emergency humanitarian assistance, identifying and implementing durable and sustainable solutions that support migrant accommodation, integration, return, and host community support. Relevant actors in this field are the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), International Organization for Migration (IOM), German Development Agency (GIZ), The Swiss Development Agency (SDC), and the International Centre for Migration Policy (ICMPD). In the realm of external actors, different EU institutions, as well as embassies of foreign governments are present and influential actors in the system. Most present state bodies are the Norwegian Embassy, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Switzerland and Germany. Interestingly, the role of UNHCR is still marked as crucial within the migration management system, despite the state officially taking over in 2008, and was described as follows by Respondent 1:

"UNHCR has the role of care provider, that is assisting in the parts where the state, for different reasons, cannot deal with the large number of asylum seekers and migrants, so it's kind of a helping role, but in many things UNHCR is still leading, for example asylum seeker resettlement to other parts of the world, mostly Western Europe, USA, Canada, et cetera. There are some roles that UNHCR holds with sovereignty, in the sense that they are the only ones doing it, but then of course they also help local non-government organizations and migrants through different programs and financing."

External actors are also dominantly present as donors for both the state and local non-government organizations. Respondent 3 emphasized the role of foreign investment in Serbia's migration management system:

"I think Serbia is finding its way, and the only reason for that is the enormous inflow of financial resources into the country. So, for now the system is kind of maintained artificially. But we fight and we keep our head above water."

Interestingly, the state does not use existing support systems, but rather outsources activities and funding to non-state actors, thereby creating a parallel system that, in some segments, entirely circumvents it.

ii. The Role of the Civil Sector

In the Civil Sector, numerous non-governmental organizations have shifted their focus to irregular transit migration due to the large numbers of asylum seekers. NGO activities are mainly humanitarian in character. They are generally focused on support, as well as capacity development. Project activities cover direct support to migrants and support to the state. The former includes free legal aid to asylum applicants, advocacy, support and protection of unaccompanied refugee minors, psychosocial assistance and counseling, intercultural mediation and integration, and translator services, while the latter focuses on capacity building through identifying and providing adequate support to the state, assisting state institutions in integration processes and professional training for civil servants.

The NGO sector is characterized by a high level of diversity and expertise. Within this sector, some organizations adopt a broader orientation towards a number of different vulnerable groups and offer their professional services through implementation of different projects, while others focus more narrowly on migrants and adopt a more

comprehensive approach to migration. Within this spectrum, the range of group and service foci varies. The nature of civil society organizations, as compared to, for instance, state structures, allows for more flexibility and faster crisis response, as it does not necessarily have to follow standardized procedures. Additionally, non-government organizations focus highly on locating and addressing faults within the system and utilize their expertise in numerous fields to identify possible strategies for improvement. This is achieved through fieldwork and report writing.

The Civil Sector, and non-government organizations in particular play a large role in the migration management system, as they compensate for the lack of institutional capacities on the part of government stakeholders. The majority of respondents characterize their impact as significant, if not crucial, and emphasize the benefits of cooperation and coordination with other local NGOs, as well as foreign actors. Respondent 1 asserted: *"…and the situation is similar in the whole region, Montenegro, Bosnia, if there was no UNHCR, if there were no partnerships, I am really afraid of how the situation would be then…"* Scarcity of resources and lack of political will are identified as the main cause of state system inefficiency, and it is seen to lead to a considerable discrepancy between written legislation and practices. While 'on paper' asylum law and migration policies aim to provide adequate support and protection, and are committed to supporting human rights of irregular migrants and asylum seekers, in practice long decision waiting times and lacking capacities undermine these goals. In fact, as Respondent 1 pointed out, laws and legislations seem to follow standards of international law, but do not reflect any true intention of the state to actually implement them in full capacity. Respondents indicate that state institutions are generally comfortable with outsourcing a considerable number of tasks necessary for an efficient functioning of the system in the hands of civil society organizations.

Through project financing, NGOs have adopted a working framework that has an undoubtedly positive impact on migration management in Serbia. In particular, they

work on making the system more efficient. For instance, NGO professionals support rule of law by ensuring proper legal procedures and offering translating services for languages generally spoken by asylum seeking persons. They do this by, for instance, appealing asylum decisions and exploring legal options and providing translators, which are crucial in ensuring exchange of information and proper allocation of support and resources to asylum seekers and irregular migrants. Respondent 6 dubbed local NGOs in Serbia the *"oasis of the rule of law"*, as a focal point through which international law may be properly and comprehensively implemented in the migration management system in Serbia.

NGOs in Serbia are largely non-profits financed by a number of actors. Aside from government funding and domestic charity organizations or fundraisers, possibly the largest volume of resources comes from foreign-based intergovernmental stakeholders, such as UN agencies, EU institutions, and embassies and development organizations of foreign European governments. UNHCR in particular has been a dominant donor in this field. It forms agreements with local non-government organizations to act as implementing partners. External funding of NGOs is implemented through project funding and bilateral agreements with external parties. The duration of projects is generally limited to periods lasting between six months to three years, after which period the NGO needs to reapply for funding. The changing volume and scope of funding (or the mere possibility thereof) renders their provision of services, and the system in general, insecure and unsustainable, as experienced by the majority of respondents. It also allows external parties to influence and shape the migration management system in Serbia through the influence of foreign-party geopolitical interests in designing and implementing projects.

From all respondent testimonies it is clear that the civil sector has an important function within the system. It takes over a large portion of necessary tasks. While some of the tasks are seen as more suitable for NGOs, due to their quick response and

flexibility, others are seen as being taken over from the state in order to bridge gaps in the system. In that regard, the civil sector seems to have both a complementary and a supplementary function within the system, in that it supports governmental institutions through community action, while at the same time supplementing certain state structures that are missing. However, Respondent 8 argued that it is in fact a 'parallel system', because large parts of it circumvent the state in both financing and implementation.

In terms of anti-migrant sentiments, the respondents sometimes emphasized the violence that takes place in neighboring countries, especially members of the EU (Hungary & Croatia) regarding illegal pushbacks and police brutality. In Serbia, anti-migrant violence largely takes place online or around refugee camps. However, anti-migrant sentiments are seen as a part of a larger 'political game' and are in a way 'expected' and 'unsurprising'. Respondents did not report this having any substantial influence on their work, except when, for instance, building a refugee camp near a smaller town. However, they do continuously attempt to bridge this by implementing multicultural projects aimed at decreasing perceived group distance between host society and migrant population. Content analysis shows that anti-migrant sentiments have to do with a range of other sociodemographic social factors and present in Serbian society, such as gender, age, education, rural/urban settlement. Moreover, anti-migrant sentiments may be seen as a direct consequence of a discursive shift towards a more securitarian framework.

b. Institutional logics

As anticipated in the theoretical framework, the data indicates the presence of three main institutional logics: state, community, and professional. In the following paragraphs, I outline how each relevant actor adopts and interprets these logics.

i. State logics

State logic seems to be largely driven by *security concerns* and *enforcing border control*. The Commissariat for Refugees and Migration remains exclusive in camp and shelter management, as well as border control. It monitors movements within its borders and allocates security officers. It also decides on the (re)distribution of asylum seekers and other irregular migrants per camp. The state is a dominant actor in ensuring access to healthcare and social protection to vulnerable groups, such as unaccompanied refugee minors. Furthermore, it is officially concerned with adoption of standards and certification of rules in the tasks that it does take on. The state is concerned with controlling its borders and determines who has the right to stay. Interestingly, bordering practices take place not only at the physical border, but also in camps and urban areas where make-shift spontaneous migrant settlements occasionally emerge. This alerted to a process named 'bordering through housing', where irregular migrants are securitized through selective placement in physical space, with the aim for them to be separated from the rest of the local population (Stojić Mitrović & Vilenica, 2019, p. 549).

Strategies of deterrence are also part of security and bordering practices strategies. At the moment, food and NFI aid are generally only provided as part of a stay in a camp, because handing them out along the route was perceived as a pull factor. The state is concerned with efficiency insofar as it allows for influential presence of non-state actors, foreign financers, and the civil sector to provide additional services that are necessary for optimal functioning. However, beyond that, the state seems to show very little initiative in making the system more efficient. This was also mentioned as the reason why a substantial part of external financing goes to the civil sector. While the state is committed to keeping order and security, it does not go as far as to change its institutional setup to completely and independently accommodate irregular migrants. This compels donors to seek implementing partners in the civil sector.

The state is largely not responsible for resource allocation within the entire system and does not function as a redistribution mechanism beyond the realm of its own institutions. Even then, state institutions are partially financed by foreign actors, which may have a limiting effect on the state's independency in allocating them. It is evident that, given the state's weak institutional competency in the field of migration, intergovernmental stakeholders have been partly operating according to state logics. Respondent 8 described the attitude of the state as follows: *the state is often passive, in many things, until someone offers financing it will not take initiative."* They also go on to say that: *"When it comes to migration, the state sees that as something where they can get projects, to offer services to donors. There it sometimes wants to take over NGO roles, because it sees financial and political interests."* In this sense, state logics operate to support the dominant securitarian discourse and show a limited interest in *economic accumulation* that can be accomplished within this discourse (Stojić Mitrović, 2018; Leerkes & Van Houte, 2020, p. 321).

On the other hand, external actors show a clear interest in allocating funds for projects that enforce *rule of law* and *redistribution of wealth* (Leerkes & Van Houte, 2020, p. 321). The latter mainly refers to their prominent role in financing the migration management system, in which external actors assign projects to implementing parties. They also monitor their implementation through fieldwork reports of local non-government organizations and are strongly present in shaping the focus of activities through projects. External actors support the rule of law through financing the modernization of camps, implementing activities that focus on intercultural mediation that tackle antimigrant sentiments and facilitate integration of refugees, and through active capacity building of state employees through training programs. Through designing, financing, and monitoring projects, external actors ensure comprehensive migration management in Serbia.

The state and external actors seem to be sharing crucial competencies in the migration management system. In other words, they may be seen to divide state logics according to own interests.

ii. Community

Civil Society organizations seem to be driven by a hybrid of two competing logics: community and professional. Commitment to community values and ideology was prominent across the research sample, as respondents continuously emphasized their commitment to vulnerable groups and their humanitarian concerns. Community logics seem to be driven by three main factors: *philanthropy*, *empathy*, and *professional concern*. For instance, Respondent 8 said:

*"I am personally motivated by the fact that we can change things, and every day we can improve. So, we can try to change, but a lot of times we also **do** change. Sometimes things will go back to the old way, but we did change them for a while. Someone has to consult us, to protect us, we did something good, and then when you have that in your head that you are a member of a group of people who share a common vision and motivation to do good, that is the main motivation for me and some of my colleagues."* (emphasis by author)

Another respondent who works with unaccompanied refugee minors framed her motivation as follows:

"First and foremost, I work to protect the children, because I think that someone needs to take care of them, and that is a sensitive subject in our society still. Taking into consideration everything that they have been through, my wish was to make their stay in Serbia as comfortable as possible. That they can have a person that they can rely on, that is my main motivation."

This was also evident in resource allocation and project implementation. Many relevant civil society organizations focus their efforts on the more vulnerable groups they believe deserve focus, for example women, unaccompanied minors, or individuals with (severe) mental incapacities. One respondent admitted that this focus on 'the vulnerable of the vulnerable' can sometimes lead to a larger group of young and middle-aged men receiving less care and support in their migration journeys and asylum procedures. Some respondents felt a moral obligation or emphatic relation towards refugees due to similar circumstances ex-Yugoslav countries experienced in the 1990s, at times due to personal experiences:

"For me personally, I have also been through that experience, so in that sense I understood the situation of those people very well. The legal framework I was also familiar with from experience, sadly, and it has not changed much. […] In Serbia, I think that there is not practically anyone whose family member or friend was not a refugee, so I think for us it is much more familiar than maybe other countries." (Respondent 1)

Furthermore, non-government organizations exemplify community logics through their local and flexible responses to unresolved issues (Vetta, 2009). Instead of acting through a standardized, bureaucratized state mechanism, they employ their ability for quick crisis response by implementing activities on a case-by-case basis, where deemed necessary. They are able to shift the allocation of people and resources as is necessary, be it for (emergency) legal aid, need for intercultural mediation, integration schemes, or ensuring human rights. However, due to project financing, they are somewhat constrained in areas in which they operate, complacent with the projects they are financed to do.

iii. Profession

Professional logics operate prominently amongst NGO professionals. Firstly, working for a smaller, domestic NGO may in some cases be seen as a stepping stone to working in bigger, international NGOs and IGOs, such as the UNHCR or the IOM, or possibly for state institutions. In any case, as trained professionals, they gain a significant amount of practical experience which may allow them to potentially advance further in their careers. In this way, they are embedded in existing political structures through their work (Vett,a 2009, p. 32). Secondly, respondents were very emphatic about the level of expertise required to the work that they do. All of them are highly educated and are doing highly specialized work in generally narrow fields. For instance, they may only focus on providing legal aid or counseling.

Mainly the way that organizations are formed and are meant to function implements a professional logics approach. One respondent contrasted this system with what he regards as pure civil society initiatives – grassroot organizations - and emphasized that emphasized that the majority of non-government organizations, as they currently operate, are prompted by foreign investment: *I don't see that there are any grassroots in Serbia that work with migrants and refugees. If UNHCR is doing a project, based on that they function. If UNHCR does not give out projects, there is no functioning, these are fabricated and unsustainable systems.* Same as during the transition period in the late 1990s, civil society organizations are 'employed' by foreign investors to expand civil society and help embed democratic practices (Veta, 2009, p. 45).

As another respondent points out, external financing is detrimental to introducing professional logics in the field, as it keeps the civil society initiatives going:

"I think everything depends on financing, at one point we can be part of the system, and in the next we are not. Although I think we are recognized as part of the system, first and foremost

by the migrants, and then also by the state. As someone they can come to, as an important source of support." (Respondent 7)

In a similar vein, when asked how their work has changed over the past five to ten years, respondents generally referred to increased levels of coordination and cooperation within the sector. Civil society has become a more institutionalized part of the migration management system through coalition forming with other NGOs, external actors, and state institutions, through participation in working groups, as well as being explicitly included in government strategies for migration management. Non-government organizations are no longer contracted for individual projects, but are pinned down as go-to organizations for their specific tasks. While the state has shown initiative to take over some of these tasks, such as care for UAC's (which was taken over by social protection), and converting Miksalište, a popular NGO information center to temporary residence and redistribution center, it appears that professional logic on part of non-government organization remains a solid and necessary part of migration management.

The civil sector is encouraged to operate in this way by the state, even though they exhibit completely opposing institutional logics and problem definitions. One could argue that this is because the adoption of professional logics on part of non-government organizations allows the state to continue functioning within a securitarian framework and to exhibit a rhetoric of closure and strong borders without having to face the consequences of narrow competences in the field of migration management (Ambrosini & Van de Leun, 2015, p. 106). It allows the state to prioritize a securitarian framework and to define migration as something that needs to be contained, because other actors in the system, i.e., non-government organizations, function as professional service providers (Scholten, 2013).

VI.   Discussion

This study has sought to shed light on how migration management systems form in countries with fragmented or lacking institutional response to irregular migration. The system in Serbia has been shown to develop uniquely based on its own nation state-context. This study not only clarifies how foreign investments operate to shape institutional logics and systems in third countries, but also how these systems respond to such incentives within their own specific contexts.

In the case of Serbia, foreign investment allowed for a proliferation of the civil sector and supported crisis response as well as more permanent and systematic support to irregular migrants and asylum seekers. However, in doing this, it has created a somewhat permanent parallel system that needs to continuously support state action. External actors, while firmly present, also actively contribute to maintaining this parallel system through short-term project financing. While the system does show signs of efficiency, it is clear that Serbia has been modified into a country of enforced stay, which prompted the need for migration to be sustainably managed in the first place. It is crucial to remember that this still is a point of friction, as it is still highly disadvantageous to migrants who predominantly see Serbia as a transit country.

In the literature discussed in this study, EU externalization projects seem to be something that 'happens' to states that experience a lot of transit migration headed to Europe. Transit countries are converted into places of enforced stay through financial incentives and promises of EU membership or 'mutually' beneficial bilateral agreements. However, an important point to be made from this study is how state structures in third countries experience this incentivization and to what extent are EU externalization policies devised the way they are because they need to complement institutional logics operating in these states. By not expanding their own institutional

logics and strictly sticking to securitarian concerns, the state compelled the civil sector to react. Because sheer community reaction was not sufficient, the civil sector was obliged to develop institutional-like systems of support and adopt hybrid operational logics in order to adequately manage the in- and outflows of irregular migrants.

Another important point to note is that the range of external actors present in the migration management system in Serbia seems to be a lot broader than described in the literature. While academic articles on the topic largely focus on the European Union as an externalizing actor, this study identified a range of external actors, both state and non-state, which operate in Serbia. It remains unclear whether different external actors have differing influences, as that did not fall within the scope of this research project. However, it could be a seminal point to include in future research.

VII.   Conclusion

The study sought to analyze how civil society organizations working with irregular migrants and asylum seekers in Serbia shape and apply institutional logics in their work. The study also examines the impact of these logics. Furthermore, it maps relevant actors in the migration management system and demonstrates how their role within that system influences attitudes and actions of civil society employees. This was studied using content analysis of NGO reports, and by conducting semi-structured interviews with persons employed with local Serbian non-government organizations.

The study found that the non-government sector has expanded their activities through domestic, but mainly external financial support. These activities are seen as crucial to the functioning of the system, and include programs that support migrants directly and activities that actively support the state system. Anti-migrant sentiments,

while acknowledged, are not (yet) shown to have an impact on the way their shape and apply institutional logics. Over the past five years, NGO presence in working with irregular migrants has shifted from a general community approach, aimed at emergency response, to adopting a more professional methods aimed at structural support of the system. Since project funding has remained present in this sector, it has allowed non-government organizations to develop more professional ways of associating with other institutions in the system.

Although this is an explorative, qualitative study, the researcher was able to develop noteworthy implications, discussion points, and concepts for future research. Firstly, I find that 'external influence' is conceptualized too broadly in literature, as the study shows a presence of numerous different actors. It is not clear whether these actors operate differently and how they shape and impact migration management in Serbia. Secondly, the role of target states in co-creating outsourced migration management should be further illuminated. In this case, the state chooses not to manage migration past securitarian concerns, which warrants the continuation of a parallel migration management system and external financing. Lastly, the sustainability and long-term effects of a system that relies heavily on project financing remain questionable for both migrants, as well a relevant actors.

Bibliography:

Akkerman, M. (2018). Expanding the fortress: The policies, the profiteers and the people shaped by EU's border externalisation programme. *The Transnational Institute*, *11*, 34.

Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of management review*, *39*(3), 364-381.

Bobić, M., & Šantić, D. (2018, December). Sigurnost EU vs. sigurnosti migranata: Srbija na Balkanskoj migracijskoj ruti. In *Forum za sigurnosne studije* (Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 219-246). Fakultet političkih znanosti-Centar za međunarodne i sigurnosne studije.

Bobić, M., & Šantić, D. (2020). Forced migrations and Externalization of European Union Border Control: Serbia on the Balkan Migration Route. *International Migration*, *58*(3), 220-234.

Boswell, C. (2007). Theorizing migration policy: Is there a third way?. *International migration review*, *41*(1), 75-100.

Bryman, A. (2016). Social Research Methods. Oxford University Press.

Carlucci, M. (2020). The key role of the Western Balkans in the management of EU-directed migration flows.

Castles, S. (2004). The factors that make and unmake migration policies. *International migration review*, *38*(3), 852-884.

De Haas, H., Natter, K., & Vezzoli, S. (2016). Growing restrictiveness or changing selection? The nature and evolution of migration policies. *International Migration Review,* 1-44.

Duvell, F., Collyer, M., & Molodikova, I. (2014). *Transit migration in Europe*. Amsterdam University Press.

Greenwood, R., Díaz, A. M., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization science*, *21*(2), 521-539.

Grupković, B., Kojić, M. J., & Petronijević, V. (2016). *Serbia on the Refugee Route-the Humanitarian Response and Legal Adjustments*. Fridrih Ebert Stiftung.

Leavy, P. (Ed.). (2014). *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Leerkes, A., & Van Houte, M. (2020). Beyond the deportation regime: differential state interests and capacities in dealing with (non-) deportability in Europe. *Citizenship Studies*, *24*(3), 319-338.

Mitrović, M. S. (2014). Serbian migration policy concerning irregular migration and asylum in the context of the EU integration process. *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, *9*(4), 1105-1120.

Mitrovic, M. S. (2019). The Reception of Migrants in Serbia: Policies, Practices, and Concepts. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work*, *4*(1), 17-27.

Mitrović, M. S., & Vilenica, A. (2019). Enforcing and disrupting circular movement in an EU Borderscape: housingscaping in Serbia. *Citizenship Studies*, *23*(6), 540-558.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. SAGE Publications.

Saide Liperi, M. (2019). *The EU's Externalisation of Migration Management Undermines Stabilisation in the Western Balkans*. Istituto Affari Internazionali.

Šalamon, N. K. (2019). The Role of the Conditionality of EU Membership in Migrant Criminalization in the Western Balkans. *Dve domovini*, (49).

Scholten, P. W. (2013). Agenda dynamics and the multi-level governance of intractable policy controversies: The case of migrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences*, *46*(3), 217-236.

Thorton, P.H., Ocasio, W., Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The Institutional Logics Perspective. A New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process*. Oxford University Press.

Vargas-Silva, C. (Ed.). (2012). *Handbook of research methods in migration*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Vetta, T. (2009). 'Democracy Building' in Serbia: The NGO Effect. *Southeastern Europe, 33*(1), 26-47.

Wissink, M., Düvell, F., & van Eerdewijk, A. (2013). Dynamic migration intentions and the impact of socio-institutional environments: A transit migration hub in Turkey. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration studies, 39*(7), 1087-1105.

Appendix:

A. Interview Topics Outline – Semi-structured interview

Introduction/Uvod:

1. Respondent background / O ispitaniku

    a. Motivation to work in migration sector (excluding personal, identifiable data) / Motivacija za rad u sektoru migracija (izuzimajući podatke po kojima bi ispitanik mogao biti identifikovan)

2. NGO motivation & involvement in migration / NVO motivacija za rad sa migrantima

    a. Projects / Projekti

    b. Humanitarian intervention/aid relief / humanitarna pomoć i druge vrste pomoći

    c. Academic research/reports / akademski radovi i izveštaji

NGOs and other actors / NVO i eksterni akteri:

3. NGO relationships with external actors (EU, IOs, international NGOs, foreign governments) / Odnosi NVO i stranih partnera (EU, međunarodne organizacije, međunarodne nevladine organizacije, strane vlade)

    a. Formulating institutional logic in accordance with external agreements / Delovanje u saglasnosti sa sporazumima

    b. Influence of external funding & donations on institutional logic / Uticaj eksternog finansiranja i donacija na delovanje

4. NGO relationship with local and national authorities

    a. Funding? What kind of lacking institutional structures are replaced by NGOs? / Koje državne institucije su zamenjene NVO

    b. Influence of relationship with local authorities on work / Kako odnosi sa lokalnim vlastima utiču na delovanje

c.　Influence of relationship with national govt authorities on work / kako odnosi sa državnim vlastima utiču na delovanje

Reshaping institutional logics / Promene u delovanju:

5.　Has NGO approach to helping migrants changed the past 5-10 yrs? / Da li se pristup NVO migrantima promenio u poslednjih 5-10 godina?

　　　a.　How? /Kako?

　　　b.　Why? /Zašto/iz kog razloga?

　　　c.　To what effect? / Kakve posledice su te promene imale na delovanje NVO

B. Codebook

◈External Actors
14 Codes:

○ challenges in collecting data
○ EU influence
○ EU influence state motivation
○ EU pressure on state
○ external actor interests
○ external influence
○ external influence in NGO sector
○ external pressure
○ International community humanitarianism
○ international convention humanitarianism
○ International NGO policy influence
○ Supporting voluntary return
○ UNHCR crucial
○ UNHCR supplementary structure

◈ Financing & Resources
18 Codes:

○ bilateral donors
○ changes in financing
○ dependence on project financing
○ donor independence
○ donors crucial
○ external financing
○ financial motivation
○ financing civil sector
○ financing going down
○ financing logic
○ financing uncertainty
○ Foreign actors leading investments
○ lack of financial compensation in humanitarian sector
○ NGO lack resources

○ political and financial interests project financing state

○ project financing

○ state financing

○ state financing through external actors

◈ Geopolitical happenings and border practices

18 Codes:

○ 'soft' diplomacy

○ 90s asylum seekers

○ 90s influence

○ border practices

○ Changes in focus

○ Changes in migration flows

○ COVID challenges

○ geopolitical circumstances

○ geopolitical interests

○ geopolitical interests' spillover into local level

○ illegal crossings

○ Inhumane practices neighboring countries

○ intercultural religious differences

○ political influences forming NGOs

○ predictions for the future

○ refugee population Serbia

○ Serbia seen as transit country

○ UAC population in Serbia

◈ Migrant rhetoric

5 Codes:

○ anti-migrant sentiments

○ migrant rhetoric

○ motivation anti-migrant sentiments in politics

○ NGO fighting migrant hate

○ safety of migrants

◈ NGO Motivation

28 Codes:

○ aim of activities

○ community motivation

○ condemning pure professional motivation

○ creating sustainability

○ Expertise motivation

○ Expertise

○ focus on individuals

○ migration flow determine focus

○ motivation advancing society as a whole

○ motivation to help people

○ NGO enforcing rule of law

○ NGO high standard practices

○ NGO humanitarian motivation

○ NGO identifying best practices

○ NGO improving the system

○ NGO local orientation

○ NGO locating and addressing issues

○ NGO policy focus

○ NGO rule of law

○ NGO sharing values with external actors

○ personal humanitarian motivation

○ Personal motivation for professional development

○ prejudice NGO workers

○ presence of religious influences

○ profession after NGO work

○ Professional expertise & experience NGO

○ professional orientation

○ specialization & expertise

◈ NGO role & activities

45 Codes:

○ Academic work - report writing

○ activity focus

- ○ Advising the state
- ○ Alerting authorities
- ○ analyzing impact
- ○ assisting the system
- ○ capacity building
- ○ civil sector important resource for state
- ○ Civil sector professional services
- ○ coordination
- ○ Exposing issues
- ○ handling external pressure
- ○ identifying challenges
- ○ improving the system
- ○ informal volunteer groups
- ○ integration support
- ○ intercultural mediation
- ○ Legal services
- ○ NGO acting locally
- ○ NGO cooperation within civil sector
- ○ NGO creating parallel support systems
- ○ NGO creating stability
- ○ NGO crucial role in asylum system and integration
- ○ NGO educating about best practices
- ○ NGO efficiency
- ○ NGO flexibility
- ○ NGO functionalities
- ○ NGO programs
- ○ NGO supervision
- ○ NGO Support in asylum system
- ○ NGO Supporting state social protection
- ○ NGO working on inclusivity
- ○ Practical work - legal support
- ○ project description
- ○ Providing legal aid
- ○ Psychosocial services
- ○ research opportunities locally
- ○ Role evolvement
- ○ Supplementary services

○ Support language integration

○ sustainability

○ translation services

○ Two NGO structures

○ UACs vulnerability

○ UNHCR partnership

◈ State Activities/Impact

32 Codes:

○ Asylum procedure inefficiency

○ complexities of asylum law

○ complexities of setting up migration system

○ Corruption?

○ Domestic citizenship law

○ EU influence state motivation

○ Healthcare provision

○ Integration in education system

○ integration practices

○ KIRS cooperation

○ lack of coordination state institution

○ Lack of state action

○ legal framework

○ NGO broader scope than migration

○ Overcomplicated state procedures

○ security concerns

○ State action: humanitarianism deterrence

○ state as a closed system

○ State embezzling money

○ State goals & aims in legislature

○ State inefficiency

○ state interests

○ state lacks capacity/resources

○ State offering basic services

○ State reaction to NGO addressing issues

○ State relying on parallel civil sector structures

○ state reports

○ state respecting human rights

○ state role in system

○ state should take bigger role in system

○ State wasting resources

○ Weak state structure

◈ System

40 Codes:

○ actors involved in migration system

○ changes in public policy 2015 onwards

○ Changes in system

○ coalitions civil + state sector

○ constructing system on the go

○ Contribution civil sector

○ coordination of services NGO

○ difficulties grassroot initiatives

○ dynamism in migration sector

○ growing influence foreign and domestic NGOs

○ Institutional structure

○ Institutional support NGO

○ Integration challenges

○ international cooperation

○ involving non-migration focused NGOs (LGBTQ+)

○ monitoring

○ need for cooperation and coordination of activities

○ need for standardization

○ need for sustainable structures

○ NGO cannot force change in state

○ NGO few staff

○ NGO focus on one segment

○ NGO important resource for state

○ NGO lacking state support to enhance system

○ NGO part of the institutional system

○ NGO relationship with state

○ non-standard structure

○ regional division of tasks

- religious organizations
- religious organizations promotion work
- safety of migrants
- shift in focus to sustainability
- social protection
- state giving responsibility to civil sector
- State having less responsibility
- system description
- task division between state and NGO
- UAC should part of civil sector
- UACs
- unsustainability

C. Content Analysis Reports

	Author	Title	Year Published
1	Asylum Protection Center	Joint Annual Report on Asylum/Migration Practice and Discrimination Challenges in Serbia in 2019	2020
2	Asylum Protection Center	Politika I praksa zaštite migranata I izbelica u Srbiji u 2017: Mehanizam privremene zaštite/Politics and practices in migrant and asylum protection in Serbia 2017: temporary protection policy	2018
3	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Dokumentovanje zlostavljanja I kolektivnog proterivanja izbelica I migranata/Documenting the abuse and collective pushbacks of migrants and asylum seekers	2018
4	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Komplementarni vidovi međunarodne zaštite u Republici Srbiji/Complementary ways of international protection in Serbia	2019
5	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Migraciona politika u diskursu predsedničkih kandidata tokom izbora 2017. Godine/Migration Politics in Public Discourse amid Presidential Elections 2017	2017

6	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Right to Asylum in Serbia/Pravo Migranata na azil u Republici Srbiji	2020
7	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Migrant Right to Social Protection in Serbia/Pravo Migranata na Socijalnu Zaštitu u Republici Srbiji	2019
8	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Migrant Access to Education in Serbia/Pristup Migranata Pravu na obrazovanje u Republici Srbiji	2019
9	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Migrant Access to Work in Serbia/Pristup migranata pravu na rad u republici srbiji	2019
10	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Strategy for coordinated action of local actors/Strategija za koordinisano delovanje lokalnih aktera u zaštiti migranata	2019
11	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	Srbija od zemlje tranzita do zemlje destinacije: Izazovi I praksa odabranih država u procesu integracije izbeglica/Srbija, from a transit to a destination country; challenges and practices of selected states in refugee integration process	2016
12	Crisis Response and Policy Center; HCIT	Between Closed Borders: Joint agency paper on refugees and migrants in Serbia in 2017	2018

13	Crisis Response and Policy Center; HCIT	Between Closed Borders: joint agency paper on refugees and migrants in Serbia 2019	2020
14	Group 484	Ne(vidljivi) u migracijskom toku u Republici Srbiji: Pitanje upisa dece migranata u matične evidencije I zaštita lica bez državljanstva/(In)visible in migration flows in Serbia: the question of registering newborns and protection of stateless persons	2018
15	Group 484	Politike migracija I azila: vodič za članove parlamenta/Politics of migration and asylum: a guide for members of Parliament	2019
16	Group 484	Zapadnobalkanska migrantska ruta u periodu izvan krize: Situacija u Republici Srbiji/Western Balkans route after the crisi: the situation in Serbia	2017
17	MIGREC	The current and future needs regarding migration, integration, and governance related research in Serbia: mapping of stakeholders at the national level	2020
18	NSHC	Help on the Route. The rights of Refugees, Migrants, and Asylum Seekers in Serbia	2017

19	Psychosocial Innovation Network	Attitudes Towards Migrants and Refugees in Serbia	2020
20	Psychosocial Innovation Network	Report on the Activities of the Working Group for Protection of Mental Health of Refugees, Asylum Seekers, and Migrants 2019-2020	2020
21	Psychosocial Innovation Network	Mental Health and Wellbeing of Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Serbia	2020
22	Psychosocial Innovation Network	Assessment of Radicalization & Violent Extremism among Youth in Serbia and Protective and Risk Factors	2020

D. Revised Ethics and Privacy Checklist

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). 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: EU Externalization of Migration and Border Management in Serbia: The Involvement and Impact of NGOs

Name, email of student: Nevena Vračar, 579760nv@eur.nl

Name, email of supervisor: Arjen Leerkes, leerkes@essb.eur.nl

Start date and duration: 1st April 2021 - 27h June 2021

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: HUMAN SUBJECTS

1.Does your research involve human participants: **YES** - NO

 If 'NO': skip to part V.

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.Does your research involve field observations without manipulations that will not
involve identification of participants. YES - **NO**

 If 'YES': skip to part IV.

3.Research involving completely anonymous data files (secondary data that has been
anonymized by someone else). YES - **NO**

 If 'YES': skip to part IV.

PART III: PARTICIPANTS

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.).

Does the study involve the risk of causing psychological stress or
negative emotions beyond those normally encountered by
participants?   `   YES - **NO**

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**

Will the study involve the participation of minors (<18 years old) or other groups that cannot give consent?   YES - **NO**

Is the health and/or safety of participants at risk during the study?   YES - **NO**

Can participants be identified by the study results or can the
confidentiality of the participants' identity not be ensured?   YES - **NO**

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.

Continue to part IV.

PART IV: SAMPLE

Where will you collect or obtain your data?

In my research, I am using two methods to collect data: semi-structured interviews with Serbian NGO professionals in the field of migration, and content analysis of reports issues by NGOs.

Note: indicate for separate data sources.

What is the (anticipated) size of your sample?

Interviews: 11; Reports: 20

Note: indicate for separate data sources.

What is the size of the population from which you will sample?
Unknown. Estimate: around 20 relevant NGOs currently operating in Serbia, possibly up to 30 core employees per office.

_____

Note: indicate for separate data sources.
Continue to part V.

Part V: Data storage and backup

Where and when will you store your data in the short term, after acquisition?
NGO reports for content analysis are openly available online for download and are therefore not sensitive material.

Interview transcriptions and audio files made during interviews are stored on a separate USB device which remained in the researcher's apartment for the entire duration of the study. Audio files were made using researcher's personal phone and transferred to the USB ASAP after finishing each interview.

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?

The author, Nevena Vračar.

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

Data was only stored on USB and deleted from other devices as soon as possible. Data was not backed up to the Cloud or any other place.

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

By removing identifiable indicators, such as name, age, place of work, place of residence, educational history, and work history from published material. Audio & transcription files are given random names that can in no way be traced to the respondents' identities (Interview 1,2,3, etc.). Files will be deleted forever after completing the thesis project. If a comprehensive list of respondents turns out to be necessary, a list of names and corresponding NGOs will be made on a piece of paper and kept in researcher's room under lock and key. When disposing of the list, researcher will make sure to shred to pieces before throwing away.

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: Nevena Vračar   Name (EUR) supervisor: dr. Arjen Leerkes

Date: 27th June 2021   Date: