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Abstract

Interaction between the civil society and the state has increased in modern democracies. This thesis analyzes the forms and dynamics of the interaction between civil society and governmental institutions in Skåne about the issue of refugee reception. This is done by examining two overarching research questions:

1. How, why and between which actors interaction occurs; and
2. How interaction develops over time and which factors influence the changing nature of the interaction.

With the theoretical framework of civil society and state relations, governance, social movements and critical junctures, a research model is developed to analyze the case of interaction between the spheres in Skåne. The research model is based upon semi-structured interviews with governmental institutions and representatives from civil society organizations.

The development of the interaction is described through the framework of critical junctures, showing the interaction developed with an intention of increased interaction and participation, while being cautious of the independence and neutrality of the civil society at the same time.

The results show that the interaction occurs through partnership, networks, funding and personal informal interaction. Shared goals and the intention of increasing interaction because it is believed to better solve the complex problems are reasons for interaction. The empirical findings point at factors such as ideological affinity, structure, resources and experience to be important to gain access to the interaction. Another important conclusion is the lack of representation of certain valuable perspectives, such as Muslim organizations or free churches. The issue of representation stems mostly from structural factors and lack of resources.

Relations between the civil society and governmental institutions in Skåne has grown closer, and the interaction is complex and dynamic. Together, the spheres address the complex issue of refugee reception. It is characterized by a mutual respect and an awareness of the necessity of an independent and neutral civil society. In spite of problems with representation, the interaction does facilitate knowledge exchange and increases adaptability to complexity. It has increased the overall participation in interaction between the spheres.
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1 Introduction

Civil society's significance for democracy is widely agreed upon and is an important research area (Amnå 2005, 9). Civil society fulfills several functions in society. It works as a democracy school, an intermediary, a service provider and community builder by offering opportunities for participation.

Not only the research field acknowledges civil society’s central role in democracy. Governments increasingly seek partnership, interaction and dialogue with civil society (Rosenblum & Lesch 2011,285). Sweden has a long history of interaction between the spheres (Trägårdh 2010,232-233). Public support has historically enabled, shaped and regulated the Swedish civil society (Berg & Edquist 2017,1). The Swedish civil society is vibrant. It is co-existing and interconnected with the state, having dynamic and interactive relations (Trägårdh 2010,232-233). The Swedish public sector values the cooperation with civil society because of its ability to strengthen democratic participation and for contributing innovative ideas. The interaction is complex, ranging from providing information to partnerships (Sveriges Kommuner och Regioner 2020,11-15).

The research field on interaction between the Swedish spheres is vast. Partnerships (Narbutaité et al. 2017), access to national policy making (Lundberg 2014) and local cooperation in times of crisis (Jämte & Pitti 2019) have been studied. However, many studies focus on delimited parts of the interaction, and not the full dynamics and development of the interaction. Many don’t examine the organizations not taking part in interaction, which inevitably contributes to a thinner description.

There is thus a need to further study and examine the complex relations and interaction between the spheres. Studying a case where changes in interaction has occurred, provides an opportunity to examine the full range of interaction. This contributes to a deeper understanding of the dynamics between the spheres. Such a case is the interaction and cooperation between governmental institutions and civil society in the Swedish region Skåne, about the issue of refugee reception.

The 2015 refugee wave led to increased interaction between the two spheres (Jämte & Pitti 2019). The number of refugees in Sweden per month increased to levels never seen before. 162,877 persons sought refuge in 2015, twice as many as previous years. The governmental institutions were not prepared for the increased reception (Kleres 2018,209). Skåne was the first arrival point for many asylum seekers and civil society quickly mobilized (Jämte & Pitti 2019). Governmental institutions soon followed suit and its interaction with the civil society started developing and overtime this resulted in partnerships. In addition to funding services targeting refugees, the governmental institutions trusted civil society with coordination and advisory roles (Partnerskap Skåne 2020, Länsstyrelsen Skåne 2020).
Several analyses about the partnerships have been performed (Strategirådet 2019, Fritzon 2019). While they provide insights on efficiency levels, none takes a theoretical approach. Neither describes the dynamics of interaction. Research on the refugee reception in Skåne specifically (Jämte & Pitti 2019), has on the one hand successfully identified the conditions affecting small social movements organizations, but on the other hand failed to look at aspects such as time span, geographic delimitations, and diversity of actors. In order to fully apprehend the interaction between civil society and the public sector, those organizations not represented in networks or partnerships must be studied as well.

In summary, by an interactionist study of the arena of Skåne and its actors with interest in the refugee question, knowledge can be added to the overall understanding of interaction between the spheres. Studying the development of interaction cumulates the empirical knowledge on how interaction is formed and developed, and which factors affects the change in the nature of interaction.

1.1 Aim and research questions

The general aim of this thesis is to analyze the forms and dynamics of interaction between civil society organizations and governmental institutions in Skåne about the issue of refugee reception. This is done by addressing the following questions:

1. How, why and between which organizations and institutions does interaction occur?
2. How does the interaction develop over time and which factors are important to the changing nature of the interaction?

1.2 Delimitations of the Thesis

Theoretical delimitations are set to theories addressing the relations and interaction between civil society and state. Theories about the civil society and state nexus facilitate comprehension of the relations. Governance theory provides an analytical tool of the nature and reason for cross-sectional networks. Social movements theory gives insights of why civil society seeks interaction. Lastly critical junctures gives an analytical tool of the development of the interactions. Even though other theories of the relations between the spheres exist, these theories are broad, cover the research questions and permit a thorough analysis of the case.

Previous studies have weaknesses in timespans. In order to achieve a greater understanding of the dynamics of interaction, a study from slightly before the refugee wave of 2015 up until today is conducted. It is also problematic to study the interaction on a local level, since it is a governmental actor on the regional level, the County Administrative Board, with the responsibility to coordinate the interaction.
In order to fulfill the aim of the thesis, the case of Skåne is interesting. In Skåne, strong partnerships between the civil society and the governmental institutions have developed. This region, experienced a shock during the refugee wave and the civil sphere was quick to take responsibility. The actors analyzed are delimited to regional authorities, since the local don’t have formal responsibilities in refugee reception, representatives from networks, coordinating organizations, organizations receiving funding, and organizations with a clear interest in the refugee reception that are not involved in formal or informal cooperation. Including these organizations are important to grasp the whole dynamics of the interaction. Civil society is not homogenous. Thus it’s crucial to analyze organizations within different fields, such as culture, religion, human rights, sports and leisure, popular education, and umbrella organizations, as well as a variety in size and degree of professionalism. Studying a wide range of organizations deepens the understanding of the dynamics of interaction.

1.3 Disposition

Chapter 2 describes the background of the case. Chapter 3 gives an overview over theory and previous research on interaction between the spheres. Chapter 4 describes the method used in the research. Chapter 5 presents and analyzes all the results found from the empirical evidence. Chapter 6 summarizes the findings and discusses them in relation to previous research and the theoretical approaches. References are presented in chapter 7.
2 Background – The Cooperation Model

Partnership Skåne, a partnership between the public- and civil sphere, was established prior to the 2015 refugee wave. Its aim was to develop new methods of integration of newly arrived immigrants with a residence permit. Nätverket, a lobby organization for civil society, has since 2006 been a regional counterpart to the public sphere and is together with governmental institutions a part of Partnership Skåne. Among other things, the partnership has developed integration methods in associations, and NAD -Network, Activity and Participation, which are initiatives to increase immigrants’ networks and understanding of the society (Nätverket 2020, Länsstyrelsen Skåne 2016).

The County Administrative Board is a link between the local population and the municipalities on the one hand, and the government on the other. It is responsible for the coordination of Early Efforts for Asylum Seekers and to distribute funding. Other governmental institutions with a responsibility concerning asylum seekers is the Swedish Public Employment Service, the Migration Agency and The Swedish National Council of Adult Education. The County Administrative Board has the responsibility to coordinate the cooperation between governmental institutions and civil society (Länsstyrelsen 2020).

The cooperation of the Early Efforts can be explained in three parts. The funding is the first. Civil society can apply for funding of activities that increase asylum seekers understanding of society, language skills, and participation in the local society (Länsstyrelsen 2020).

The second part is a cross-sectoral network, The County Coordinating Group, consisting of representatives from the governmental institutions, and representatives from Nätverket, other regional NGO’s, and researchers from the academia. Its purpose is to exchange information, strive for an even distribution of activities for asylum seekers, support local organizations, follow up on activities, and increase situational awareness (Länsstyrelsen Skåne 2016, 4).

The third part is the model of the coordination. It is influenced by NAD’s structure with sub-regional coordinators from the civil society. The coordinators act as bridges between the civil society and the governmental institutions. The purpose of this partnership is to strengthen civil society, exchange knowledge, facilitate learning and to ensure multiple perspectives for the coordination of the Early Efforts (Länsstyrelsen Skåne, 2016,4).
3 Previous Research and Theoretical Framework

3.1 Civil Society and State Nexus

Civil society is often conceptualized as a sphere separate from the state and the market (Alexander 2006,31). It is thought to be the arena of moral and social life (Rosenblum and Lesch 2011,285), caring about the common good (Edwards 2009,63). It has several important roles in democracy; intermediary channel, service provider, community builder and democracy school. These roles are important for the positive change and development of democracies (Harding 2012, 45).

By acknowledging civil society’s importance for democracy, the public sphere invites and includes the civil sphere in policymaking (Lundberg 2014,16), entering partnerships on issues formally belonging to the public sphere (Rosenblum & Lesch 2011,285). The notion of civil society as a “magic solution” to problems created by the state and the market is shared by theorists, policymakers and activists (Edwards 2011,4-5). The relations between civil society and government are seen as not only mutually beneficial, but also critical for the functioning of both spheres (Sellers 2011,124). Civil society’s roles are conducted both in partnership and as protest to politics and policymaking (Harding 2012,45). It’s activities contributes to policymaking (Trägårdh 2013,195).

Some scholars claim the move towards partnership brings some negative consequences (Rosenblum & Lesch 2011,294). The relations between the spheres are understood as a zero-sum game, where the state poses a threat to civil society’s vitality and survival, by compromising its neutrality and independence. Governments not only encourages and facilitates citizen participation, but risk forming and condition civil society development (Peci et al. 2011,378). Other researches argue the spheres are intertwined and interdependent (Trägårdh 2010,227-228). Sellers (2011,127) claims the relations are increasingly complex with new dynamics of their interdependence, such as increased engagement from the civil sphere in the delivery of social services, various partnerships between the spheres, and decentralization of policymaking. He further proposes that the societal changes one on hand sprung out of the shifts, and on the other hand has driven the shifts. The relations between state and civil society are thus complex, interdependent and constantly evolving.

One aspect of the interdependence is the connection between interaction and the roles civil society has in democracy, and good governance is linked to civil society activities (Akhmedzhanova 2014,217). The intermediary role is carried out in networks, partnership or in dialogue with governmental institutions. It’s dependent upon the government’s efforts and structure (Rosenblum & Lesch 2011,289). For interaction between the spheres to be positive for the civil society’s ability to carry out its intermediary role, it is important with diversity in the interaction and input in policymaking. Without diversity, we run the risk of
some resourceful organizations dominate the process are high, which challenges the democratic ideal of political equality (Lundberg 2014,15).

Another aspect of the interdependence is the services to citizens. The services are numerous and diverse, e.g. women shelters, language training or soccer practice. Civil society provides spaces where people can address problems the government do not solve (Kunreuther 2011,55). The government both forms the institutional framework in which civil society organizations operate, and often fund their activities. By entering partnerships with civil society, the state enables civil society organizations to provide services that are formally the state’s responsibility (Rosenblum & Lesch 2011,291-292). Interaction between the spheres also increases the civil society’s engagement to perform their services (Sellers 2011,124). Nevertheless, when the state funds different projects or activities, there is risk of the organization becoming a subcontractor to the state instead of their members’ voice. Furthermore, partnership not only gives incentives for certain activities, “ordered” by the state, but also imposes requirements on the organization, forcing them to change in order to meet public measures, professional norms and move from volunteers doing the work, to payed, professional staff (Wijkstöm & af Malmborg 2005,84,295). A more professional civil society, instead of a civil society based upon voluntary work, might thus be a bi-product of the conditions set by the state for its funding.

Amnå (2006,16) raises the concern of civil society organizations being at the public sector’s “mercy” stands in the way of the democratic values of pluralism and autonomy. Yet, many civil organizations are dependent upon governmental funding for survival, and partnership with the public sphere might be mutually prosperous. There is also a risk those organizations not having a certain degree of “professionalism” and an organizational structure with hired staff, do not have the competence or resources to apply for funding. Those organizations are left outside both interaction and funding.

To summarize previous research of civil society and state nexus gives insights valuable for this thesis. The relations between the spheres is not seldom needed for both spheres’ practices and functions. Governmental funding facilitates the ability to perform services. Interaction helps the government to develop better practices while simultaneously giving opportunities for civil society to act collectively and to be heard. However, seeing the roles civil society plays in democracy, its independence and neutrality is vital. The interaction is important for both spheres although it comes with a risk of compromising civil society’s neutrality and independence. An important aspect to have in mind when studying the interaction is the civil society’s need for independence and neutrality and the complexity and interdependent relations between the sphere.
3.2 Governance and Policy Network

Governance is defined as “The interactive process through which society and the economy are steered towards collectively negotiated objectives” (Ansell & Torfing 2016,4). According to Bevir (2011,2) policymakers perceive civil society organizations as resources for co-produced policymaking and services, and invite them into networks. Complex problems need multiple sources of knowledge, resources and capacities, and interaction between different actors are needed in order to exchange or develop ideas (Ansell & Torfing 2016,2-4).

Interactive processes commonly takes place within policy networks, a concept referring to cross-sectoral networks with a plurality of actors. These networks emerge when cooperation is necessary for effectiveness (Enroth 2011, 19-23), when a long term goal is shared, or when actors want to formulate ideas and establish new relational structures (Keast 2016,443). The common goal is emphasized by many scholars as important for cooperation. However, according to Akhmedzhanova (2014,229) cooperation only occurs when both goals and preferred strategies are shared. The networks are characterized by interdependence, coordination and pluralism (Keast 2016,443). Different perspectives are brought together, rather than acting as a unitary voice (Korff et al. 2017,90-97). Policy networks promote high learning capacity and adaptability to handle complexity. It is a flexible system, with informal cooperative arrangements and a high level of diversity among its actors. This creates opportunities for repeated interaction, facilitates knowledge exchange and handles complexity (Duit & Galaz 2008,324).

The study of policy networks is complex. Sellers (2011,137) suggests a macro analysis with close attention to micro-level dynamics in order to fully capture shifts and dynamics in the relations. This view is shared by the anti-foundational approach. It suggests the study of networks should be based on how the individuals in the networks perceive their positions and interests. Instead of examining structures and institutions, actors are the object of analysis; how they interact, and which problems they seek to address in cooperation with others (Enroth 2011,26). Kenis (2016,155) suggests a focus on structure, processes and actors when studying these networks. He argues the collaboration process are best understood through communication, sharing responsibility and decision making. By scrutinizing the actors, how they direct, coordinate and allocate resources through the common goal gives important perspectives and insights of the network analysis. Marsh et al (2009,635,636) suggest an analysis of the whole network and not a bi-partial analysis of one organization in relation to the government. Organizations interact with each other in the network, and interaction affects the policy outcome. They could see an advantage of triangulated data when analyzing networks. The view of different organizations on themselves and others consequently gives a broader picture of the interaction. This is an interactionist approach – the analysis of how players engage with each other and the arenas in which they interact. It facilitates analysis of the strategic action which players engage in, and the goals and missions they have in mind. Determining whether the network is “open, where all partners
are equally involved, or closed, where the network is governed by the lead organization, is according to Kenis (2016,150,156) another important factor in the study of networks and governance.

In summary, a study of policy networks should entail analysis of structure, actors and processes, through the perception and perspectives of the actors. Not only of their relations to the state, but all the interrelations in the network. The structures where interaction occur, the intentions and purposes of each actor, and what kind of actors having access, are useful when analyzing the dynamics of interaction. It is also possible to study which factor influences the interaction by examining the actors’ perspectives. An important insight from governance theory is the relations between civil society and government being mutually beneficial and critical for the functioning of the respective spheres.

3.3 Social Movements and Political Opportunities

Social movement theory provides a theoretical approach to why the interaction between civil society and government occurs. It emphasizes political opportunities which is defined as “the set of characteristics of a given institution that determines the relative ability of (outside) groups to influence decision making” (Princen & Kerreman 2008,1130). The governmental institutions’ structure, openness and receptiveness impact the ability for civil society organizations to influence policymaking (Lundberg 2014,28). Della Porta (2018,3,6) emphasizes the importance of the concept as she defines as the “political conditions that reduce the costs of mobilizing”. She suggests, civil society’s perception that the governmental institutions are unable to address a present emergency, constitutes a political opportunity.

In the social movement theory, the networks’ importance is emphasized. Through networks organizations attempt to seize and transform political opportunities (Tarrow 2011,121). Networks are especially important for organizations with limited resources (della Porta 2018,4). Networks of both cross-sectoral nature and internal to civil society exist. The internal networks act as a unified voice as a counterpart to the state. When Bazurli (2019,347- 350) studied civil society’s and local governments’ interaction. He found networks were used to gain strategic advantages. Civil society chose to engage were ideological affinity was present. The governmental institutions’ structures, and how they were able to include civil society was found as crucial to the alliance-building process.

Political opportunity is the literature on social movements’ answer to why interaction occurs. Networks an answers to how. This leaves the question of who the interaction involves. Lundberg (2014,28) criticizes the theory of being vague in terms of predicting which actors being invited to the policymaking by the government. He suggests it is those organizations being seen as legitimate by the government institutions. Organizations using conflict are consequently reducing its opportunities. Tarrow suggests the organizations’
actions triggers governmental facilitation or repression, which might reshape the organizations. Jämte and Pitti (2019,426-429), found that those organizations being perceived as radical, politicized, competing or challenging had less chances to interact with the governmental institutions. Another important factor is the organizational structure. Tarrow (2011,127-129) argues that centralized organizations dominate the movement sector, at the expense of smaller decentralized organizations.

In conclusion, why interaction occurs is explained through political opportunities, referring to either the structures impacting the organizations ability to access the interaction, or to the perception that the government cannot fulfill its obligations. Factors influencing access to interaction is according to the theory ideological affinity, organizational structure and perceived legitimacy.

### 3.4 Critical junctures

The critical junctures theory attempts to answer why institutional change happens at certain points (Hogan & Doyle 2009,212). It’s of particular use when analyzing a development or a change caused by a shock such as the refugee wave. Institutional changes are perceived as a result of a cleavage or a shock in the society. According to Collier and Munck (2017,2), a critical juncture is a major episode of institutional innovation, occurring in a distinct way and generating an enduring legacy. A shock or cleavage creates mandate for change in policy or structure (Hogan & Doyle 2009,213-214) and a period of uncertainty with increased opportunities for interaction, cooperation and innovative process changes, where the actors’ choices have a higher probability of affecting the outcome (Capoccia & Kelemen 2007,348). The institutional innovation, is conceptualized as changes that are significantly different from the established patterns, creating institutional legacies shaping future developments of the institutions (Jämte & Pitti 2019,413).

The critical juncture provides an analytical framework for persistent enduring changes as a result of a shock in the society (Collier & Munck 2017,2). It is used to interpret developmental processes (Capoccia & Kelemen 2008,343). The purpose of using the framework is to trace the trajectory when describing an institutional change, linking a sequence of events (Hogan & Doyle 2019,214). This is useful in order to scrutinize the increased interaction. Using the framework also facilitates an analysis of which factors are important to change in interaction.

Hogan and Doyle (2009,215) propose major crisis causes actors to question the efficacy of the status quo, causing a collapse of the ideas underlying the existing policy. The actors will therefore propose new ideas, which either gain influence, or not. If the actors consolidate around the new ideas, significant institutional innovation follows. The overall result will be a critical juncture. This idea resonates with Capoccia and Kelemen (2007,344) who emphasize the actors’ choices as crucial to understand the process of the critical
juncture. The choices and new ideas of the actors are central to the critical juncture theory. Collier and Munck who developed one framework for the study of critical junctures, proposes the analysis of following: the antecedent conditions, the shock, the critical juncture, the mechanisms of production and the legacy. Their framework allows a scrutiny of the development over time, and to analyze how the nature of interaction between the spheres changes. This framework is presented in more detail in the appendix.

**Antecedent conditions** are how the situation was prior to the shock or the cleavage. If the critical juncture framework is used in the method of process tracing or testing hypothesizes, the antecedent conditions are a source of alternative hypothesizes for explaining the outcomes of a critical juncture. Collier and Munck recognize the risk of this category being vague and too broad, but do however claim that the gained knowledge is crucial for the analysis (Collier and Munck 2017,3-5).

**Shock or cleavages** prompt social movements to produce mandate for change in policy or structure. The shock is not the critical juncture, but does however trigger the episode of institutional change, such as legal change or changes in interaction. Not all cleavages or shocks trigger a critical juncture, why the concepts mustn’t be confused (Collier & Munck 2017,3-5).

**Critical juncture** is an episode of institutional innovation, generating an enduring legacy. According to Collier and Munck (2017,6), the critical juncture is divided into two stages; the mechanisms of production and the legacy. Capoccia and Kelemen (2007,349) argue the unit of analysis should be an institutional setting where the actors have more liberty to make innovative decisions in period of change such as the structured interaction between organizations.

**Mechanisms of production** are the steps towards the legacy (Collier & Munck 2017,3). Institutions adopt new strategies and structures, developing into a specific direction (Hogan & Doyle 2009,213-214). To analyze the mechanisms of production, aspects of decisions and choices of the actors are important.

**Legacies** are the stable and durable institution containing mechanisms of reproduction. When studying the interaction between the civil society and the governmental institutions, the legacy would be how the interaction occurs after the critical juncture, and the mechanisms of reproduction those processes accounting for the stability (Collier & Munck 2017,3,6).

The critical juncture framework facilitates analysis of when, why and what change occurred. It encourages a focus on sequences, steps leading to both the critical juncture, and steps leading to the legacy (Collier & Munck 2017,8). The shock is a political opportunity, where actors’ choices have a higher possibility to trigger institutional change. Examining the antecedent conditions, the mechanisms of production and the legacies, gives a broader picture of interaction between the civil society and governmental institution, to understand why and how interaction not only occur- but also changes in nature. It allows a description of
how the interaction develops over time. Using the framework together with other analytic tools, facilitates the identification and discussion of which factors are important in the changing nature of the interaction.

### 3.5 Summary

Hitherto the review of previous research and theoretical frameworks provides insights and analytical tools to study the case of interaction between civil society and governmental institutions. Synthesizing the theoretical lenses’ approaches to the research questions results in an adequate understanding of how to approach the case study.

**Table 1. Summary of theoretical approaches to the research questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Civil society and state nexus</th>
<th>Governance and policy networks</th>
<th>Social movements and political opportunities</th>
<th>Critical junctures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does interaction occur?</strong></td>
<td>Dialogues</td>
<td>Policy networks with a plurality and divergence of actors</td>
<td>Networks in order to act as a unified voice</td>
<td>Choices and decisions of actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why does interaction occur?</strong></td>
<td>Interaction is important for both spheres to carry out their functions</td>
<td>Address complex issues neither sphere can manage alone.</td>
<td>Perception that the government do not do enough</td>
<td>Shock produce mandate for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between which organizations does interaction occur?</strong></td>
<td>State and organizations wanting funding Professional organizations are favored</td>
<td>Actors with shared goals. Cooperation if preferred strategies are similar.</td>
<td>Actors with ideological affinity organizations with professional structure, not seen as radical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does the interaction develop over time and which factors important to the changing nature of the interaction?</strong></td>
<td>The relations are constantly evolving</td>
<td>Divergent actors come together to exchange ideas and develop new forms of relational structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shock gives mandate for change. Choices of actors produce institutional innovation and new ways of interacting. Antecedent conditions important to understand the change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Methodology

The understanding of the research philosophy is crucial to build a research model. The researcher’s ontologically and epistemologically views affect methodological choices. This research model is built upon an interpretivist and interactionist approach. Interpretivism allows the researcher to have multiple views, and the problem is seen through the participants’ eyes, when inquired about an issue or a problem (Rashid et al 2018,2). In other words, allowing the actors to be active in the study and not mere objects of observation gives multiple perspectives and a thicker descriptive of the case. By analyzing the interaction between civil society and the state through the actors’ perceptions of the research questions, a more informed and sophisticated construction of interaction is possible. The interviewees use their words while relating to their experiences and perspectives. As a complement, official reports and memorandums provide triangulated data when these evidences are compared with the answers from the interviews. The analysis of the synthesis of the actors’ experiences and beliefs adds cumulative knowledge to the understanding of state and civil society interaction.

4.1 The Case Study

A case study allows in-depth study of one single unit, in this case the “arena” where interaction occurs between governmental institutions and civil society organizations in Skåne. Gerring (2004,342) defines the case study as “an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units”. It facilitates the identification of essential factors, processes and relationships (Rashid et al 20018,5) which makes a case study an apt method in order to cumulate knowledge about the interaction.

Case studies are common but not without critique. One problematic aspect of the case study is that the concept is used to describe a variety of methods, and there is no universal definition of what it is (Gerring 2004,341-342). Consequently, to overcome some of the weaknesses, a careful methodological discussion of the research design is crucial. Deciding whether or not to use a case study is a tradeoff between thickness and generality (Coppedge 2012,115). The case study method increases the probability of an accurate description and analysis of the particular case, while it has limitations in terms of generality. However, the conclusions drawn from the study in this thesis may be tested on other Swedish regions on similar issues in future studies. By many case studies, the research field might build general theories. Thus, in order to achieve a deep understanding of civil society and state dynamics, case study is the best method.

The case in this thesis is defined as the arena where interaction between governmental institutions and civil society occurs at a regional level, about the issue of refugee reception in Skåne. The time span consists of
mid 2015 until early 2020. The interaction and partnership has come a long way in Skåne and interaction has evolved. Therefore it provides a good case to generate empirical knowledge and to answer the research questions.

4.2 Research Model

The synthesis of the theoretical overview provides insights to use in a methodological framework. In order to answer the first research question; “How, why and between which organizations does interaction occur?”, the theories suggest scrutiny of networks, partnerships and funding. However, there is a need to be open for other ways of interaction, why questions such as; “describe the nature of interaction” and “goals you hope to achieve with the interaction” are asked to the interviewees.

To answer the question of between who interaction occurs, a closer analysis of the actors inside and outside of the interaction is performed with focus on criteria set up by the County Administrative Board, legitimacy/status, professional structure, and ideological affinity. The organizations are then categorized for their access level and compared in a table with those criteria set up by the governmental institutions and those suggested by theory. The analysis is supported by the perspectives of the interviewees, and the presentation allows a discussion of the factors impacting the access. The analysis of the organizations, together with the perspectives of the interviewees increase the reliability of the conclusions. This analytic tool provides a deeper understanding of between who interaction occurs.

Civil society organizations are categorized as;
1: No interaction with governmental institutions
2: Informal interaction through inquiries and dialogue
3: Receiving funding for activities, not participating in network
4: Participating in network, not receiving funding
5: Participating in network, receiving funding
6: In partnership

For the second research question; “How does the interaction develop over time and which factors are important to the changing nature of the interaction?” - the critical juncture theory provides framework and methods. The use of this particular framework allows an understanding and provides a model for which conditions, events, interactions and mechanisms can be analyze. Using the stages in the critical juncture, allows for a profound analysis of the trajectory. In addition, to fully capture shifts and dynamics in the relations, governance theory is applied to capture micro-level dynamics. Analyzing the networks and asking questions to each actor about their perception of both themselves and other actors allows for triangulated data.
Lastly, the participation in the interaction occurs on different levels, which is an important aspect when studying the nature of the interaction. Castel (2019,39) presents a tool in order to decide the participation level which is useful for this study. Modified to fit this thesis, a similar tool has therefore been developed. The memorandums from the network and the interviews are used as evidence and assessed according to the ladder of participation. The changes are then illustrated and discussed with theoretical and empirical background, which will be useful when answering the second research question.

**Table 2. Ladder of participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Participants get to</th>
<th>Example of method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>One-way communication</td>
<td>Know</td>
<td>Information meetings without dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>News-letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td>Collect opinions, non-regularly</td>
<td>Have an opinion</td>
<td>Surveys, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogue</strong></td>
<td>Exchange thoughts, regularly</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Dialogues, workshops, cross-sectional networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation</strong></td>
<td>Activities are planned and executed together</td>
<td>Execute, do together</td>
<td>Work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Codetermination</strong></td>
<td>Collective decision making</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Counsels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 Collection of data**

The collection of information relies mostly upon interviews with key persons with insights and perspectives about the interaction. In order to identify them, an observation of the field was necessary before starting the research. By inquiring the coordinators and the County Administrative Board, looking through memorandums of network meetings, the first key persons were identified. Those actors not in active interaction were found by identifying the gaps. Which actors are missing? Which perspectives are not yet heard? In order to understand the dynamic of the interaction, it is equally important to understand why some associations were never in the game, even if it seems natural they would have an interest in interaction.

The purpose of the initial observation was to identify key players with the aim of providing a starting point. Snowball sample recruitment was then used to find other interviewees with interesting perspectives, contributing to an informed picture of the interaction between the spheres. Snowball sample recruitment is a good method when identifying key persons. However, it comes with a risk of bias, since the actors known by other actors are most likely to be recommended for further interviews. This is overcome by examining the field from different perspectives, and consciously looking for the perspectives missing in the interaction in addition to the snowball technique.
The interviews were semi-structured with the objective of gathering information about the dynamics of the interaction. The organizations are delimited to those governmental institutions with a formal responsibility for immigrants and refugees at a regional level in Skåne, civil society organizations participating in networks, and those providing service to refugees and immigrants, with or without governmental interaction. The organizations come from different geographical locations in Skåne and vary significantly in terms of size, purpose and resources. Religious associations, sport organizations, public education associations, humanitarian associations, cultural associations and umbrella organizations are represented in the sample. The organizations also vary in terms of professionalism, degree of voluntarism and geographical range. This ensures a broad picture and representation of the civil society with interest in the refugee reception in Skåne.

A total of 17 interviews were conducted. The governmental institutions are the County Administrative Board, which has the leading role in the coordination and cooperation, and the Migration Agency. The third governmental institution present in the beginning is the Swedish Public Employment Service. They contributed when they had a project targeting asylum seekers, but then ceased to participate in the interaction (Interviewee 1). Since the County Administrative Board has the formal responsibility to cooperate and coordinate the activities with the civil society, its perspectives are enough to describe the interaction from a governmental perspective, especially when adding the views of the Migration Agency. The Migration Agency and Swedish Public Employment Service had a more informative role (Interview County Administrative Board, Interview Migration Agency, Interviewee 1, 2).

Deciding to what extent the civil society organizations or their representatives should be anonymized is a tradeoff between validity and research ethics. The Swedish Research Council sets up valuable guidelines in order to protect the individuals participating in a research study. It consists of four requirements, information, consent, confidentiality and usage (Vetenskapsrådet 2002,7-14), all of which has been carefully considered in this study. Because some of the information is sensitive, and the number of interviewees is rather small, the categorization must be enough in order to ensure the validity of the thesis. It would of course be easier to control the validity if all organizations would be named. However, ensuring anonymity gave more reliable answers, since the interviewees could feel secure critique to certain aspects of the system could not harm them, the system or the relations to other actors. The civil society organizations and representatives thus remain anonymous in this thesis. However, the names of the organizations that are participating in the formal network and partnership is written, since it is public information.

Having another look at the categories, 4 interviews from civil society organizations without interaction was conducted, from three different organizations. 1 Interview with a representative of an organization with informal interaction. 2 Interviews with organizations receiving funding for activities, but not participating in networks, 2 Interview with an organizations participating in networks, not receiving funding, 1 Interview
with an organization both participating in network and receiving funding and 5 interviews with organizations in partnership.

The interviews are structured with open, broad question, and follow up questions in order to get a deep understanding of the issues. The interviewees are first asked to describe with their own words their organizations’ work with refugees, and describe the interaction from slightly before the refugee wave until today. Follow up questions are asked about changes in interaction and which factors they identify as important. Questions about how and why interaction take place, and which actors missing in the networks and partnerships. The interviewees are also asked to give their perspectives on why some actors are not participating. The interviews are conducted in Swedish, and all the quotes are the interviewer’s translations. This is to ensure no language barriers would alter the information, since there is a varying degree of how comfortable the interviewees are speaking English.

Besides interviews, a scrutiny of official reports and memorandums from various networks provides additional empirical data. Alternative sources for the empirical collection allows triangulated data and controls for memory issues, seeing the refuge wave of 2015 is a few years back already.
5 Empirical Findings and Analysis

5.1 The Dynamics of Civil Society and State Interaction

This section focuses on the dynamics of civil society and state interaction in Skåne on the issue of refugee reception. This is done by a scrutiny of how, why and between who interaction occurs. The empirical findings is presented and analyzed. Below, the figure illustrates the dynamics of the interaction. The different interaction forms and aspects are described in the following subsections.

Figure 1. The Dynamics of Civil Society and State Interaction

5.1.1 Networks

Networks are an important part of the interaction between the spheres. Interaction through networks occurs both cross-sectoral with the purpose of cooperation inside the system, and internal to civil society, with the purpose of acting as a unified voice as a counterpart to the state outside the system.

The County Coordination Group is a cross-sectoral network where the County Administrative Board is the governing actor (Interview County Administrative Board). The network is thus closed. It is the County Administrative Board in dialogue with the other actors who decides which organizations to invite (Interview...
County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,5). The purpose is to exchange information, strive for an even distribution of activities for asylum seekers in Skåne, support local organizations, follow up on activities and increase situational awareness (Länsstyrelsen Skåne 2016,4). Issues such as asylum seekers’ accommodation and needs, and civil society’s problems related to the executing of the services are addressed. It is also a source of new cooperation. Through the network, contacts are formed which lead to projects and activities in cooperation between different organizations (Interviewee 6,7).

**Other networks inside the system**

Besides from the County Coordinating Group, the coordinators facilitate network meetings for the organizations receiving funding for the Early Efforts, and other local organizations with interest and experience of refugee reception. The network meetings are held at a regular basis, built upon the needs of the organizations and the asylum seekers. The purpose is knowledge exchange, dialogue and network building. They often occur in the sub-regions, but in some issues the whole region is invited. Occasionally, the governmental institutions are invited as guests in order to answer questions or inform civil society about new rules or the overall situation (Interviewee 3,5).

One of the organizations receiving funding expressed a satisfaction with the network meetings as a channel to the governmental institutions (Interviewee 9). In some municipalities, there are local networks where civil society are invited to discuss refugee reception with local authorities (Interviewee 5,9), however, in most municipalities the local authorities claim the issue of refugee reception is not their responsibility (Interviewee 5).

**Other networks outside the system**

Networks outside the system internal to civil society is another form of interaction. These are used to convene and to act as a unified voice in order to raise concerns and to ask questions to the governmental institutions. “Flyktingparaplyet” (An umbrella network of refugee issues), has existed since the late 1990’s with the purpose of convening, exchanging information and knowledge, and twice a year having dialogues with the Migration Agency and the Boarder Police (Interviewee 7,11). Some of these organizations are also participating in the County Coordinating Group (Interviewee 6). When asked of the distinction between the two networks, one organization participating in both expressed it is as working together inside the system in the County Coordinating Group, and outside the system as a monitor in Flyktingparaplyet (Interviewee 7).

Another network mentioned was “Rätt till tro” (Right to faith, my translation), which is an ecumenical network, guarding the converts right to refuge. On a national level it is pressuring the Migration Agency about how to judge the sincere faith of a convert seeking refuge. They claim the Migration Agency do not know which questions to ask, and that it is a matter of chance if the asylum seeker is believed or not. Rätt till Tro has not been invited to the County Coordinating Group (Interviewee 14).
What are the reasons for networks? Being part of the County Coordinating Group is seen as important to work inside the system and contribute with civil society perspectives to processes owned by the governmental institutions (Interviewee 1,6). It is also a strategic choice, to purposely establish contacts for cooperation even outside the group (Interviewee 6). Networking is also seen as important to achieve knowledge, communication and to be seen and heard (Interviewee 4,6). For the County Administrative Board, the network contributes with knowledge about the overall situation of refugees and services in Skåne (Interview County Administrative Board). To increase interaction, improve the relations, and to improve the system of reception and early efforts are seen as goals for all actors. There is an overall agreement this is the goal (Interview County Administrative Board, Interview Migration Agency, Interviewee 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8). There is also a common perception that the issue is complex and both spheres are needed to solve it (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,5,6,7).

Another interesting finding is that the issues discussed between the spheres is limited to those where an ideological affinity is present. Where the perspectives differ, such as paper less immigrants, there simply is no discussion in the cross-sectional networks (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 6,7). By being clear about the mandate of the governmental institutions, discussions about issues that cannot be addressed are avoided (Interview County Administrative Board). Conclusively, both the goal and preferred strategies to reach the goals are shared in the County Coordination Group, and questions where there is no consensus is handled in other forums (Interviewee 6). Similar reasons are seen in the network meetings the coordinators arrange. Actors contribute because they want to convene, exchange knowledge and give their perspectives on issues regarding refugee reception, and to find new partners for cooperation (Interviewee 8).

In the network outside of the system, the main reason is to convene and to act as a unified voice (Interviewee 6,7,11). As one of the organizations said “When we act together, we have the ability to ask our questions and raise our concerns, something smaller organizations would never have the chance to do on their own. Now, we get to talk with decision makers within the governmental institutions” (Interviewee 7). Here, the issues where there is no consensus between the spheres are addressed (Interviewee 6).

5.1.2 Partnership

The coordination model of the Early Efforts is a partnership. Tasks and responsibilities formally belonging to the public sphere are now performed by the civil society through the close cooperation with the County Administrative Board (Interviewee 1).

How does the partnership work? The partnership is a formal agreement between civil society organizations and the County Administrative Board. Malmö Ideella is an umbrella organization representing civil society organizations in Malmö. It coordinates the Early Efforts in the Malmö region. Sensus is a
popular education association, coordinating the middle and the south sub-regions of Skåne. Save the Children coordinates northwest of Skåne and is a humanitarian right organization. It exists in many countries around the world, and this particular part of the organization has a regional focus. Red Cross Hässleholm coordinates the northeast sub-region. It has humanitarian rights focus, and is a locally anchored division of a worldwide organization. The process of the partnership and the coordination model is supported by Nätverket. The coordinators are supposed to coordinate the efforts in their sub-region, work for knowledge exchange, create networks, map asylum seekers’ needs, and act as a bridge between civil society and the governmental institutions. They meet at a regular basis, both only the coordinators, and together with the County Administrative Board, to discuss matters concerning the coordination (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2,3,4,5).

The partnering organizations are responsible for recruitment and all the employer responsibilities. The costs are funded by the County Administrative Board (Interviewee 4). The cooperation process is led by the County Administrative Board with support from Nätverket (Länsstyrelsen Skåne 2017,5). The involvement of Nätverket in supporting the process has gradually increased (Interviewee 1,2,5). Nätverket’s focus to ensure civil society’s independence and neutrality, and to communicate civil society’s perspectives, is seen as an important function of the partnership (Interviewee 3,5).

What are the reasons for the partnership? The coordinators act as a bridge between the civil society and the governmental institutions. This contributes to the perception of a higher degree of partnership. The coordinators channel the preferences from the civil society to the governmental institutions, and can to some extent influence the direction of the funding (Interviewee 3,5). As one of the coordinating organizations expressed; “There is always someone to talk to, who listens to our proposals and ideas. From my perspective changes therefore happens faster. Since the coordinators act as the bridge, we are able to understand both the governmental – and the civil society perspectives. We can thus support the governmental institutions to form their practices to meet the civil society’s and asylum seekers’ needs, and vice versa” (Interviewee 3).

The partnership is thus seen as a way to have better access to the governmental institutions, and beneficial for the whole civil society. However, there are some concerns regarding which tasks and responsibilities that are carried out. The civil society’s separation and independence from the public sphere is seen as crucial (Interviewee 3). “We always risk our independence and neutrality when entering a partnership with the public sector, it is a balance we all have to keep” (Interviewee 1). Even the County Administrative Board recognizes this issue, and claims to be attentive of the dilemma (Interview County Administrative Boars), a view shared by the civil society organizations (Interviewee 1,2,5,6).
When asking the organizations why they engaged in partnership, one of the interviewees said: “To be honest, we thought it increased our status and legitimacy to have a coordinator. It made us more relevant as a part in society, regionally and locally” (Interviewee 4). Another interviewee meant partnership is an opportunity to cooperate and influence within the system, and by doing so being able to show the strengths of civil society (Interviewee 1). The belief that civil society has a lot to contribute with in the refugee reception was common by the interviewees. Another reason for partnership was to be able to set common goals early in the process. Being in partnership with the governmental institutions is also seen as a way to co-develop the mission (Interviewee 1,6). Civil society actors believed there is an intention of the governmental institutions to bring closer the spheres, and that the governmental institutions recognizes the strengths and capacity of the civil society in times of crisis (Interviewee 1,2,5,6,7). The County Administrative Board argues the partnership with civil society enables increased efficiency, and a higher possibility to have dialogue and inform the local civil societies (Interview County Administrative Board).

5.1.3 Funding

How is the funding organized? Distribution of funding is the responsibility of the County Administrative Board (Länsstyrelsen 2020, Interview County Administrative Board). Criteria of the funding and its purposes is set by the government (Interview County Administrative Board). Funding are possible for activities about Swedish language and knowledge about society and labor market. Discussions about which activates that meet certain needs of the asylum seekers take place in the network and in the partnership (County Administrative Board 2017-f,2018-a,e).

Even though applying for funding is perceived as complicated and time consuming (Interviewee 4,6,9,12,13), the coordinators don’t help the organizations to write the applications for funding, nor do they formally take part in the decision making of which organizations that receive funding. It is seen as an important distinction about what is responsibility of the coordinators and the governmental institutions (Interviewee 1,2). The coordinators do however, inform the civil society about the possibility to apply for funding, and gives advice to the organizations on asylum seekers’ needs (Interviewee 5). They also channel the knowledge and perception of asylum seekers needs to the County Coordinating Group and the County Administrative Board (Interviewee 3).

What are the reasons for the interaction? The funding is important for many actors in the civil society. Some organizations are entirely dependent on governmental funding for their capacity to deliver services (Interviewee 1,2,6). The governmental institutions express cooperation with civil society is crucial for their ability to succeed with integration of asylum seekers (Interview County Administrative Board).
The coordinating organizations expressed that interaction with the governmental institutions about the funding of activities strengthens the civil society’s role as a community builder, because they to a certain degree have the possibility to impact which activities are being funded (Interviewee 3), and how to prioritize among the different activities and geographic locations, even though it is the County Administrative Board taking the formal decision (Interviewee 1,3).

5.1.4 Personal and Informal Interactions

Aside from the interactions taking place within different formal forms inside or outside of the system there are also other personal and informal ways of interaction. Many of the organizations with low degree of interaction described interaction on a personal level, when aiding the asylum seekers in processes, such as schools, migration agency, health care etc. (Interviewee 9,12,13,14). This interaction might be encouraged by the governmental institutions (Interviewee 13,14) or seen as a nuisance (Interviewee 12). As one interviewee described this, it is not a matter of interaction inside the system, but rather guide or support individuals through the system (Interviewee 11). Nevertheless, it is still seen as important for the organizations being present, and the interaction is perceived as urgent (Interviewee 12).

The reason for this interaction is the sense of urgency, -that something “must be done” (Interviewee 5,12,14). One of the interviewees expressed the interaction as this; “We did not target asylum seekers as a group, but they came and knocked at our door, and then of course, since we do humanitarian and social work, we helped” (Interviewee 14). It is interesting to see it is those organizations outside of formal interaction within the system, still having an interest in the refugee reception, that mainly act on a micro-level.

5.1.5 Participants

In this section, a closer analysis of who takes part in the interaction is presented. The analysis is based upon the Early Efforts coordination model, and analyzes all the organizations that were interviewed. In order to understand between which organizations interaction occurs, it is equally important to scrutinize between whom interaction do not occur.

The County Coordinating Group consists of actors supposed to represent the breadth of civil society, and governmental institutions with responsibilities concerning asylum seekers (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2). Table 3. shows the representation over time, from different aspects of the civil society. Some organizations represent several aspects of the civil society, and those are marked as (2). For example, Rf Sisu Skåne is a public education association representing sports associations. Thus, they are
categorized in both popular education and Sports and Leisure. The information in the table is based on interviews and memorandums.

Table 3. Representation in network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental institutions</th>
<th>Umbrella organizations</th>
<th>Popular education</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
<th>Sports and Leisure</th>
<th>Religious Association</th>
<th>Cultural Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Administrative Board</td>
<td>Skånes Studieförbund I Samverkan (2)</td>
<td>Rf Sisu Skåne (2)</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>Rf Sisu Skåne (2)</td>
<td>Swedish Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Migration Agency</td>
<td>Skånes Folkhögskolor I samverkan (2)</td>
<td>Studieförbund I Samverkan (2)</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Public Employment Service</td>
<td>Nätverket</td>
<td>Skånes Folkhögskolor I samverkan (2)</td>
<td>Individuell Människohjälp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skånes Föreningar</td>
<td>Sensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malmö Ideella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table, the religious associations are limited to the Swedish church. There is no free churches, or Muslim assemblies represented in the network. In the interviews, perspectives that both free churches and Muslim assemblies have valuable insights and perspectives, were lifted (Interviewee 12,14,15). Free churches are often involved in asylum processes since they have many converts in their communities (Interviewee 14). Without doubt they have perspectives other civil organizations do not raise. The Muslim assemblies are not represented either. Many asylum seekers come from Muslim countries (Migrationsinfo 2020), and participate in prayers, and communicate with the imams (Interviewee 12). Lack of representation from these organizations, with personal knowledge and connections to the asylum seekers, is seen as a representation problem (Interview County Administrative Board).

No organizations represent culture. Cultural organizations might be ethnic organization, Muslim organizations or associations working with culture around Skåne. Cultural organizations represent a big part of the Swedish civil society. Only sports- and lobbying/interest organizations are bigger (Vogel et al. 2003,30). Some interviewees represented in the County Administrative Group expressed that the diversity of the group facilitates a representation of the whole civil society, and that the umbrella organizations has the capacity to represent all their member associations (Interviewee 1,2,6,7). According to the County
Administrative Board, umbrella organizations such as “Skånes Föreningar” are supposed to represent all civil society organizations in Skåne (Interview County Administrative Board). However, it raises the question of how many perspectives one representative from an umbrella organization may have and channel at the same time. The organizations interviewed that are not participating in the County Coordinating Group has mixed views on representation in networks. As one organization from the Muslim community stated;” We have contact with the asylum seekers, we should be seen as a resource in the work. Our perspectives are really important, but we do not have the privilege to prioritize participation in several of those forums we identify as necessary to achieve our vision” (Interviewee 10). A representative from a free church stated; “The belief that the Swedish church could represent all religious associations is estranging to me” (Interviewee 15). Another representative highlighted that; “It is better than nothing that the Swedish Church is there. But they can’t represent our views and experiences” (Interviewee 14).

5.1.6 Analysis of factors influencing access

Having established a representation problem, it is important to analyze possible factors for the access. This is interesting both for the academia, but also for the purpose of diversity in policymaking. According to theory, factors influencing access are ideological affinity, perceived legitimacy/status, and the organizational structure. However, there is also formal and informal conditions set by the governmental institutions needing attention. The criteria for partnering organizations was a good working environment; capacity to have a neutral and facilitating role –independent of political or religious views; provide a working place in their own facilities, offer a collegial network to the coordinator, being used to cooperate and have good relations to the public sector; have knowledge in asylum related questions –and own activities connected to the asylum seekers. They were also supposed to have a network in the sub-region (Länsstyrelsen 2017, Interview County Administrative Board).

For the County Coordinating Group, the County Administrative Board said they looked for organizations with the ability to represent the civil society and not only their organization, regional or at least sub-regional perspectives and experience with the target group. Legitimacy was important, but having a person to reach out to was identified as the main obstacle (Interview County Administrative Board). The criteria set by the County Administrative Board can be boiled down to experience, professional structure, regional/sub regional, and the ability to represent civil society. Another factor is added, resources, based upon the interviews with the civil society organizations expressing that interaction and cooperating cost resources (Interviewee 6,7,9,10).
In the table above, the organizations are categorized by their access level in the rows, and the factors that according to the theories and the interviews influence access represent the columns. The assessment is built upon the interviews. The factors are coded dichotomously, apart from were perspectives differed, where a 0,5 point is given. If the organization is rewarded a 1 it means that requirement is fulfilled, a 0 means it is not fulfilled.

Scrutinizing the table, all factors have importance for access. The higher degree of access and interaction the more important they are. Resources, and professionalism, i.e. organizational structure, is a watershed for the higher degree of access. If organizations have resources to participate, and a professionalism with hired staff they seem to have a bigger opportunity for cooperation and interaction. Many of the organizations not participating in network or partnership witness of lack of resources and time (Interviewee 7,12,14). The organizations with higher access degrees also mentioned that the networking and cooperating with government requires much resources; they have to prioritize the cooperation and interaction they engage in.
(Interviewee 4,6,7,8). One of the organization with no interaction said; “Applying for funding is time consuming and complicated, so we just focus on our activities instead” (Interviewee 12).

When asking the County Administrative Board about the deficit in interaction, they pointed out the need of a key person in an organization having time and capacity to participate, and that the intention is to have all the whole spectra of civil society represented in the network, but that the factors related to the organizations capacity to participate was an obstacle (Interview County Administrative Board).

In sum, interaction occurs between governmental institutions, and those organizations with experience in working with asylum seekers, having a professional structure, and resources to participate, have a regional or sub regional range, are perceived as legitimate, share an ideological affinity and lastly have the ability to represent the civil society. All these factors are important for interaction, and the organizational structure is crucial for higher access degree.

5.1.7 Summary

Interaction between the spheres are dynamic, complex and interdependent. It occurs through networks, funding, partnership and informal personal interaction. There is an outspoken belief from both sides that cooperation leads to better practices. Interaction is strived for, even though there is a consciousness of interaction coming at the risk of civil society’s neutrality and independence being compromised. Both civil society and governmental institutions value the interaction and exchange of perspectives and knowledge. It is seen as strategic as well. The funding is crucial for many civil society organizations to perform services, and the services are crucial for the governmental institutions to fulfill their responsibility of supporting the asylum seekers and facilitate their integration. Interaction within the system occurs when goal and preferred strategies are shared. On issues where the spheres do not reach consensus, civil society organizes itself outside the system.

Interaction is depending on all the factors emphasized by the literature. However, maybe most importantly the organizations’ structures, such as professionalism and resources, seem to influence the access level. In other words, the organizations lacking these resources and structures have lesser possibilities to interact and to influence policy processes. Interaction costs resources not available to all organizations. This is important since the lack of representation does not seem to be because of bias, but rather structural factors. In order to attain a more diverse representation the structures could be adjusted to enable organizations low on resources but with valuable perspectives to engage in interaction.
5.2 How does the interaction develop over time and which factors are important to the changing nature of the interaction?

The critical juncture framework is used to describe changes in interaction between civil society and governmental institutions in Skåne about the issue refugee reception. To analyze which factors are important to the changing nature of interaction, the changes themselves must be identified, and the nature of the interaction described. This is done by assessing the participation level according to the ladder of participation at each stage. In the previous sub-section, it is established that the interaction forms may be divided into; network, partnership, funding and personal informal interaction. Personal informal interaction is outside of the system. It is mainly help and support for the asylum seeker, and not interaction as such, why it constantly stays at the information degree on the ladder of participation. However, the other interaction forms have developed, which will be illustrated in this sub-section.

The trajectory of the change is described, and the level of participation in matters of network, partnership and funding are assessed. After describing the different stages, a discussion of the factors changing the interaction is presented.

5.2.1 Antecedent conditions

The cooperation between civil society organizations and governmental institutions was rare, not connected to “the system” before 2012 when the Swedish Public Employment Service got the coordinating role in integration. Nationally and regionally, agreements between the spheres to work together inside the system with integration became increasingly popular. Nätverket was created as a result of these agreements, as a counterpart to the regional authorities to have dialogues for cooperation and partnership (Interviewee 1).

The civil society in Skåne and governmental institutions started to cooperate and formed a partnership on a related issue; integration of immigrants already having residence permit. There was a regional agreement, where the Region, The County Administrative Board, the Municipalities and civil society through Nätverket, met regularly in the sub-regions (Interviewee 1). However, refugee reception was not the issue discussed (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2). Funding targeting immigrants could only be sought by municipalities, even though they sometimes did it in cooperation with the civil society. The funding also targeted activities to those newly arrived with residence permits and not asylum seekers (Interview County Administrative Board).

Before the refugee wave, interaction between the spheres, about the refugee reception was not formal and certainly not a partnership (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2,6,7,11). The internal network Flyktingparaplyet consisted of different civil society organization, all with formal structure and
payed employees. They formed in the 1990’s and still gather. They meet 6-8 times per year, and every six months have a dialogue with the Migration Agency and the Border Police, where they ask questions about refugee related issues and deliver their opinions as a unified voice. The main purpose was to give knowledge to the civil society and clarify matters. Occasionally, the Migration Agency and the Boarder Police received input on matters identified as crucial by the network (Interviewee 7,11). The interaction is described as interaction outside of the system, where the civil society do not cooperate within it, but is in opposition, acting as a monitor and representing their organizations’ interests (Interviewee 1,11).

The ladder of participation suggest participants gets to “know” on the first participation level -information, and to have opinions on the second -consultation. This suggests a level of consultation for the interaction at the time for the network interaction form, since both information and occasional input of opinion occurred.

Partnership and funding did not exist on the issue of refugee reception.

### 5.2.2 Shock

In 2015, a large number of refugees came under a short period of time. This preceded a mobilization of the civil society. The perception of both the County Administrative Board and many of the civil society organizations (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2,5,7,12,13) is that the perceived urgency of the situation caused mobilization.

The civil society wanted to help the asylum seekers with shelter, food, clothes and advice. As one organization said; “We were active together with other organizations. Together with our members, we met the refugees at the central station. It was easy for us to make contact, since we spoke the language. They turned to us as guides to the society. We gave support right there at the station, and helped those in need for shelter overnight. We stayed in touch with the Migration Agency during that time and showed the refugees how to get there. This was the situation for about 4-6 weeks” (Interviewee 13).

Civil society’s mobilization was crucial for the governmental institutions to succeed with their responsibilities. However, there was a lack of coordination (Interview County Administrative Board). The Migration Agency later expressed a regret of not having had the capacity to receive help and support from all the volunteers offering their help (County Administrative Board, 2016-a). One of the interviewees expressed; “We were ready with food and clothes and other things at the harbor. We saw what they did in Malmö and wanted to do the same thing here in Trelleborg. However, even though we mobilized wanted to engage and to contribute, the Migration Agency immediately came with busses, and the refugees did not receive our help.” (Interviewee 12).
The interaction at the shock was concerning absolute necessities. Governmental institutions were perceived to take a step back, discussing matter in between governmental institutions and not with the civil society. This critique was lifted both internally and externally (County Administrative Board 2016-a, Interviewee 1,2). Once again turning to the participation level, it is fair to say the interaction at this point must be describes as consultation. At some personal levels, dialogues occurred (Interviewee 13), but there is no indication of cooperation within the system, or dialogue at this point. Thus, networks remained at the consultation level, and funding and partnership did not yet exist.

5.2.3 Critical juncture

Both internal and external critique towards the lack of coordination from the governmental institutions caused a clarification of the governmental institutions responsibilities in relations to the efforts of the civil society, and a more pronounced responsibility of the County Administrative Board to coordinate and facilitate the efforts and activities performed by the civil society (Interview County Administrative Board).

At this point, the government decided to fund activities targeting asylum seekers, through a new funding of Early Efforts to Asylum Seekers which could be applied for by civil society organizations. The County Administration Board was given the task to coordinate these activities and to distribute the funding . They invited some actors in the end of 2016 in order to update, share knowledge, and to discuss what was needed in order to have a readiness and long term perspective on the integration. Following section describes the decisions, choices and trajectory towards the legacy.

5.2.4 Mechanisms of production

The steps towards the legacy was far from predetermined. From both sides, the cooperation model is described as a “pilot” and the steps as experimental. When something needed to change, it was changed in dialogue, with both the mission of Early Efforts, and civil society’s independence and neutrality in mind (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,5).

After realizing the interaction, cooperation and coordination of civil society and its activities needed improvement, the mechanism of production began. The governmental institutions identified the need of civil society’s perspective, seeing the Early Efforts should be built upon the activities already performed by the civil society. In order to facilitate the mission of coordinating and facilitating the civil society’s activities, the County Administrative Board invited civil society organizations identified as key actors, to dialogues about civil society’s needs. Nätverket, who already was part of Partnerskap Skåne was acting as a consultant early in the process (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1, County Administrative Board, 2016-b).
Together, Nätverket and the County Administrative Board formed a network in early 2017, called “The County Coordination Group “, where civil society organizations, and other governmental institutions were invited to have dialogue about the situation and the coordination of the Early Efforts (County Administrative Board ,2017-a). Broad representation in the network was seen as important, with organizations representing religious organizations, humanitarian aid, popular education and sports, which was supposed to represent the whole range in civil society (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2).

The representation of the civil society was seen as crucial since the Early Efforts are built upon their activities (County Administrative Board, 2017-a). In the network, the situation of refugees and the civil society was discussed. How many who had applied for the funding, and what the civil society thought about the process. At first, the civil society could ongoing apply for funding. However, the application process was seen as stressful. Early in the process, interest in applying for the funding was low. Some of the organizations were hence given the task of mapping activities to improve communication (County Administrative Board, 2017-b).

In the early steps of the mechanisms of production, the interaction is at the consulting level. Some actors were invited to an information meeting, where they could express their opinions and experiences of the refugee wave (County Administrative Board, 2016-a). The two following meetings about the Early Efforts’ coordination were however performed with only governmental institutions. In those meetings, the importance of civil society’s perspectives were stressed, hence different civil society organizations were invited (County Administrative Board 2016-b, 2017-a). Participation level hence increased to dialogue. Now, funding was also in place. Since civil society having the opportunity to give their opinion, the funding reaches the participation level of consulting at this stage.

When the first steps were taken, the cooperation continued to evolve. The County Coordinating Group continued to be a reference group (Interviewee 1). In the network, they raised questions regarding cooperation between civil society organizations, the asylum seekers’ situation, and had opportunities to ask questions to other governmental institutions such as the Migration Agency (Interview County Administrative Board, Country Administrative Board 2017-c). In the network the process of application was discussed, alongside with how the distribution of funding should be prioritized (County Administrative Board, 2017-f). In the County Coordination Group, how to develop the coordination model and the partnership was discussed (Interviewee 1).

The Early Efforts is inspired by NAD’s coordination, with coordinators at sub-regional levels. In the process of building the coordination model, Nätverket was given a consulting role, when formulating the requirements for the partnering organizations. However, it was the County Administrative Board who chose
which organizations eventually entering the partnership (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1).

12 interest expressions came in to the County Administrative Board regarding the coordinating role of a sub-region (County Administrative Board, 2017-d). The decision fell upon Sensus, Save the Children, Red cross Hässleholm and Malmö Ideella. For the southern sub-region, there were initially not any solution, and Malmö Ideella was asked to together with another association -Kompetenscenter Idéburen Sektor to hire one coordinator at full time and take both the Malmö region and the Southern sub-region (Interviewee 1,2).

Adjustments were made in the application process of funding, and soon more applications than expected came in (County Administrative Board 2017-c). However, the quality was regarded as too flawed, and there were indications of organizations not applying because it was perceived to be too complicated. Thus, the coordinating organizations were given the task to support and write a guide in how to apply for funding (County Administrative Board, 2018 a). It was the County Administrative Board who decided which organizations receiving funding, and this was not discussed with the coordinators (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 2).

The partnership in the coordination begun with some difficulties, mostly regarding the roles of the coordinators and the County Administrative Board. The coordination model is described as a pilot. Initially, the roles and responsibility were unclear, and both sides perceived an imbalance. The County Administrative Board set the agenda and controlled the coordinators’ activities. Both the County Administrative Board and the coordinating organizations expressed a mutual goal of equality. This lead to a higher degree of involvement of Nätverket, acting as a process leader of the meetings, and dialogue of how to achieve a balance (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2,5). It also resulted in the mission of Save the Children to support the coordination and write a reflection paper (Fritzon 2019).

Regarding the funding, information was given to the civil society through the network. Their perspectives were listened to, and adjustments were made. However, civil society did not have any voice in which organizations receiving the funding, why the assessment stays at consulting and not dialogue. The network on the other hand still are at a dialogue level, it continued to have dialogues about the mission and how it was supposed to be formed (Interviewee 1). Seeing the partnership initially had imbalance in power structures, the participation at this point was somewhere between the level of dialogue and cooperation. There was a workgroup in place, which is a characteristic of cooperation, however, with the County Administrative Board setting the agenda, it can be said to have the characteristics of a dialogue rather than a work group.
5.2.5 Legacy

After the adjustments and changes were done in 2019, all organizations in partnership now describe more power balance between the County Administrative Board and their own organizations (Interviewee 1,2,3,4,5). Several of the organizations in the network express their perception that civil society’s independence from the state has been taken seriously from the governmental institutions (Interviewee 1,2,4,5,6,7,8).

The coordinators missions are to; Map asylum seekers’ and organization’s needs; Work for coordination and cooperation; Bridge knowledge from civil society, and their needs, to different actors, locally and regionally (County Administrative Board, 2018-a, Interviewee 5). A part of this mission is executed by inviting civil society organizations with funding to network meetings, with the purpose of informing and exchange experience and knowledge (County Administrative Board, 2018-b, Interviewee 1). The coordinators also have regular meetings with each other, and with the County Administrative Board, in addition to the County Coordinating groups. The coordinators also send out newsletters to the organizations receiving funding, and other actors they identify as key actors (Interviewee 5).

The coordinators have a bridging role, however, interaction between civil society and the County Administrative Board do not stop there. There are larger dialogue meetings with the organizations receiving funding, in order to discuss the matters which lies completely under the governmental institutions’ responsibility, such as the funding distribution and to identify challenges and opportunities. These are carried out and planned by both governmental institutions and civil society (County Administrative Board, 2018-e,2019-c).

The County Coordination Group meet regularly (Interview County Administrative Board). They have recently discussed the group’s purpose (Interviewee 5), which can be seen as mechanisms of reproduction. When the coordinators’ roles became clearer, the groups participation were somewhat reduced to be more consulting (Interviewee 1). There is internal critique of a misrepresentation. Both civil society organizations and the County Administrative Board perceive it as a problem that other faiths than the Swedish Church are not represented, especially the Muslim community are thought to have valuable insights perspectives, and knowledge about the asylum seekers (Interview County Administrative Board, Interviewee 1,2,5,10).

Besides from wanting to increase the interaction of those groups currently not being represented, there are other changes and developments in the pipeline. The regional agreement of Partnerskap Skåne, about the integration of immigrants changed, and the regular meetings were canceled. Nätverket has thus been given the mission to find and propose a new model for regional cooperation between the civil society and governmental institutions, were the Early Efforts, and NAD are more integrated (Interviewee 1).
Assessing the legacy through the ladder of participation for funding, network and partnership gives some concluding insights about the changes in the nature of interaction. Through the network meetings with the coordinators, the connection and interaction between the local civil society organizations receiving funding, and governmental institutions has increased. Having the possibility of coordinators hired in the civil society anchors the work and gives more influence to the civil society (Interviewee 1). There is therefore a dialogue about the funding. The network, the County Cooperation Group’s importance was somewhat reduced when the coordinators were hired and installed in their mission (Interviewee 1,5), the participation level is now somewhere in the middle of consulting and dialogue. The partnership on the other hand is by all participants regarded as more balanced, with equal opportunity to set the agenda. The final decision making is still a matter of the governmental institutions, why the coordinating partnership stays at cooperation.

5.2.6 The Ladder of Participation

Having described the nature of the interaction during the different stages of the critical juncture, a closer analysis of the participation levels allows more insights in changes, which enables a discussion about which factors are important in the changing nature of the interaction.

Table 5. Participation level at the different stages of the critical juncture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>Critical juncture</th>
<th>Forms of interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stages</td>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2015</td>
<td>Antecedent conditions</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2015-2016</td>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2016-early 2017</td>
<td>Early Mechanisms of production</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2017-2018</td>
<td>Later Mechanisms of production</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the participation level increased over time. For example, the partnership went from no interaction in the antecedent conditions to cooperation in the legacy. It is evident the critical juncture did produce more interaction at a higher participation level between the civil society and the governmental institutions. The critical juncture theory proposes institutional innovation begins after a shock, where social movements create mandate for change, and analyzing this case seems to verify this. By analyzing the mechanisms of production, the intention of a fruitful partnership seems to have been present on both sides. Efforts were
made in order to create the system where civil society participation were higher. The intention of both the civil society organizations and the County Administrative Board seems to be an important factor in the development and the changes in interaction after the shock. Since the cooperation model is inspired by NAD, it is fair to say that experiences and other systems influence the trajectory of the cooperation and interaction as well.

5.2.7 Summary

The interaction before the refugee wave occurred in networks outside of the system. However, on the related issue of integration of immigrants, interaction had developed between the spheres. When the refugee wave occurred, the civil society was fast to mobilize, and in hindsight the governmental institutions had internal and external critique about how they failed to cooperate with the civil society in times of crisis. One can argue this led to the increased mandate for change, and choices and decisions to cooperate with the civil society step by step increased interaction and participation level between the spheres. Besides the outspoken intention of bringing the spheres closer, (even though the civil society’s neutrality and independence were guarded carefully), it is easy to draw the conclusion previous experiences with interaction influenced the trajectory of interaction as well. Experiences from NAD and Partnerskap Skåne guided the way, and dialogues between the actors made it easier to keep the balance and to find a model of cooperation that both served the purpose of coordinating the Early Efforts and in the same time kept civil society’s independence and neutrality. Interaction and participation have generally increased. There are both more forms of interaction on the issue of refugee reception, and the interaction forms also developed into higher participation levels. The interaction between the civil society and the governmental institution has developed over time, and it is continuing to do so through mechanisms of reproduction and a system that is built to handle complex and changing issues.
6 Conclusions and Discussion

The general aim of this thesis was to analyze the forms and dynamics of interaction between civil society organizations and governmental institutions in Skåne about the issue of refugee reception. By answering the question of “How, why and between who interaction occurs?” and “How does the interaction develop over time and which factors are important to the changing nature of the interaction? a nuanced description of the complex dynamics has been possible.

The study shows interaction occurs in networks, partnership, funding and in personal and informal forums. Governmental institutions do form the institutional framework in which the civil society operates and interact through partnership, network and funding, as suggested Rosenblum and Lesch (2011, 291-292). However, there is an eagerness to involve the civil society in the process of forming the institutional framework, and how the funding is used.

The networks within the system has a plurality and divergence of actors, who share the same goal and preferred strategies. According to the theory, policy networks promotes high learning capacity and adaptability to handle complexity. It is flexible and creates opportunities for interaction and exchange of knowledge (Duit & Galaz 2008, 325). This is supported by the findings in this thesis, and a view shared by the participants. The partnership in the coordination and cooperation model is meant to be a bridge between the spheres. It opens up channels for smaller local organizations to the governmental institutions. This says a lot about the intentions from both sides, to have a good and close cooperation, however cautiously balancing neutrality and independence at the same time. The bridging function of the partnership spills over on the interaction of the funding. Having coordinators hired in the civil society instead of the public spheres create a proximity between the spheres, and opens up new channels for civil society to raise concerns and give opinions, as well as co-developing some aspects of the funding process.

The different theoretical lenses emphasized different reasons for interaction. In Civil Society and State Nexus, the importance of interaction to both sphere’s abilities to carry out their functions is highlighted. Governance theory suggests interaction occurs in order to address complex issues neither sphere can manage alone, and to exchange knowledge and perspectives. Social movement literature stresses the sense of urgency, and the perception that the government do not do enough to be important for the interaction. Critical juncture sees the shock, i.e. the refugee wave, as a producer of mandate for change. This study confirms all perspectives brought up by the previous research. The interaction is believed to be mutually beneficial and strengthening both spheres and the asylum seekers’ situation. By interaction, a better situational awareness is believed to be achieved and thus the system is better equipped to handle complexity. Interaction is also a strategic choice in order to establish contacts for further cooperation.
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One interesting finding of why interaction occurs is the division between interacting inside or outside of the system. The notion of Akhmedzhanova (2014, 229), that interaction in policy networks occurs when both goals and preferred strategies are shared is partly true. On issues where there is no consensus, civil society acts outside of the system, in networks or in personal informal interaction. However, same actors interact within the system on those issues where consensus is present, and outside the system on other issues. This should be seen as an indication that civil society’s independence and neutrality has not been damaged by increased interaction, even though a more thorough analysis of civil society’s ability to fulfill its roles in democracy ought to be conducted to reach a certain conclusion on that matter.

When shared goals and preferred strategies do seem to be an important factor for interaction, there is another concern of access. Organizations lacking resources and professionalism are, unintentionally, shut out. This is seen mostly in the higher interaction levels (networks and partnership), but even in the funding and application processes. Important perspectives are missing when cooperating with civil society, and when the notion of representation by other organizations might to some extent compensate, it is arguably so that in more complex and specific issues, this is not enough. If the goal is to have the representation of the whole spectra of civil society in order to have access to diverse perspectives, a model where the organizations currently outside of the interaction can enter should be developed. Wijkström and af Malmborg (2005,84,295) raised the concern that interaction between civil society and state imposes requirements on the organizations, forcing them to change in order to meet public measures, professional norms and move from volunteers doing the work, to payed, professional staff. Tarrow (2011,127-129) on the other hand argues centralized organizations dominate the movement sector, at the smaller decentralized organizations’ expense. However, the analysis of this thesis shows a more nuanced problematization. It is true that professional norms and professional staff is a watershed for participating in the interaction. However, it is not necessarily so that this is required by the state, but rather that interaction costs resources and time, which is simply not available in small organizations without employees. The County Administrative Board expressed the intent of cooperation with these organizations, but had not managed to reach and engage them. The notion that umbrella organizations represent all their members are not supported by those organizations outside of the interaction. In this perspective, governmental institution should consider models that enables smaller organizations with important and valuable perspectives to engage in the interaction.

For the second question, how the interaction develops over time, and which factors that are important in the changing nature of the interaction, the critical juncture framework, together with the ladder of participation was useful. It allowed an analysis of the development, showing civil society mobilized because of the perception that the government did not do enough. Interaction developed because the refugee crisis created mandate for change in how civil society and governmental institutions cooperated and coordinated the activities targeting asylum seekers. The intention of balancing neutrality and independence with increased interaction has affected the actors’ choices and decisions when producing the model. Previous experiences
with NAD and Partnerskap Skåne has also influenced the development. The interaction has indeed increased, with a higher participation levels, when neutrality and independence according to the interviewee’s perspective remain more or less intact.

Conclusively, the interaction of civil society and state is complex and dynamic, and has increased. By balancing the independence and neutrality while increasing the interaction, a partnership has developed, coordinating the Early Efforts and facilitating interaction and cooperation between the spheres. The relations are characterized by mutually interdependence and the intention of close cooperation. However, issues of lack of representation of important perspectives are present, which could be a future area of research – How can actors with valuable perspectives to the policymaking be included even though the structure and resources of the organization do not currently allow participation? Another question both the academia and policymakers would benefit from scrutinizing is how civil society’s ability to perform its important functions in democracy are influenced by increased interaction.

This study has some limitations and strengths that warrant attention. One limitation is generality. The conclusions drawn from the interaction between civil society and governmental institutions in Skåne about the issue refugee reception cannot necessarily be generalized. However, if more studies on the interaction take place on other regions in Sweden, it is likely to show some aspects of the dynamic being general in Sweden. The County Administrative Board represent the government in the regions, and all County Administrative Boards have the same mission from the government to coordinate the efforts and the cooperation with civil society. A second limitation is the relative small sample of interviewees. Time constraints did not allow further collection of information. However, this study has several strengths. The organizations interviewed represent organizations with interaction ranging from none to partnership, and organizations from the whole spectra of civil society. This has given the opportunity to understand the full dynamics of civil society and state interaction. A second strength is the use of the critical juncture framework, giving a detailed description of the development of the interaction, and an analysis of which factors are important to the changing nature of interaction. The thesis is strong in its thickness, describing and analyzing many aspects of the interaction, through the actor’s perspectives. This enabled some interesting findings, such as the interaction occurring simultaneously inside and outside of the system, and that both the governmental institutions and the civil society are conscious of civil society’s neutrality and independence when purposely increasing interaction.
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### Critical Juncture Framework of Collier and Munck

#### Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Mechanisms of Production</th>
<th>Critical Juncture</th>
<th>Cleavage or Shock</th>
<th>Antecedent Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durable, stable institutions.</td>
<td>Steps through which the legacy emerges.</td>
<td>Major episode of institutional innovation that generates an enduring legacy.</td>
<td>Critical juncture routinely seen as a fundamental or retrenchment event.</td>
<td>Diverse features of economy, society, and politics. May include the legacy of prior critical junctures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms of reproduction, i.e. sources of stability that sustain the legacy. Relevant include self-replicating causal structure, freezing and stickiness.</td>
<td>In some cases, the features of the critical juncture map directly onto legacy. In others, it is complex reactive sequence. Increasing returns as causal mechanism.</td>
<td>Neoliberal transformation in legal, institutional, political, and economic domains.</td>
<td>In some cases shocks should be called a shock-debt crisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Constant&quot; types of rival hypotheses. The question of &quot;Which is a juncture 'critical'?&quot;.</td>
<td>Increasing returns as causal mechanism.</td>
<td>Establishing equivalence among diverse historical episodes.</td>
<td>Source of rival hypotheses for which the critical juncture is characterized by contingency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sources of endogenous hindrance. How much time is needed to evaluate the legacy?</td>
<td>(1) The question of hindrance. What are the different ways in which a critical juncture occurs?</td>
<td>(1) Dangers of confusion: distinguishing between cleavage or shock and the '911 critical juncture.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Can chronic political instability be incorporated as a stable legacy?</td>
<td>(4) Contingency v. determinism. Can critical junctures and shocks not be critical.</td>
<td>(3) Cleavages and shocks do not necessarily produce a critical juncture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Contingency v. determinism. Is the self-replicating causal structure of the legacy inherently deterministic?</td>
<td>(4) Contingency v. determinism. Is the self-replicating causal structure of the legacy inherently deterministic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issues and Debates

(1) Contingency v. determinism. Can "critical" junctures and shocks not be critical. | (3) Cleavages and shocks do not necessarily produce a critical juncture. Likewise, a critical juncture could occur without a prior cleavage or shock. |

---

Source: Collier and Munck 2017, 3