



## **Final Country Report - The Netherlands**

Stijn Verbeek, Peter Scholten, Han Entzinger, Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), Netherlands

Contact: [s.r.verbeek@fsw.eur.nl](mailto:s.r.verbeek@fsw.eur.nl)

May 2012

3-NL

With financial support from the European Commission





## Contents

1. Introduction		4
2. Activities of local authorities		6
3. Leadership and planning process		13
4. Outcomes		15
5. Factors influencing outcome		17
6. Learning		19
7. Conclusion		21
Appendix 1	A brief note on methodology	23
Appendix 2	AMICALL survey The Netherlands (in Dutch)	24
References		26

## 1 Introduction

This report summarises the main findings on the Netherlands that have emerged from the AMICALL-project. AMICALL stands for 'Attitudes to Migrants, Communication and Local Leadership'. The basic purpose of the project is to collect information on what activities local and regional authorities in the participating countries in Europe have set up to communicate with their citizens so as to promote immigrant integration. AMICALL also aims at assessing the impact of these activities and at comparing them with similar activities in other European cities.

Currently, about 11 per cent of the Netherlands' population of 16.7 million are foreign-born and for that reason can be qualified as immigrants. One in five persons living in the country is either an immigrant or a child of an immigrant. The number of residents with „non-western origins“, as official Dutch statistics call them, stands at around 1.9 million, well over one-tenth of the population (SCP, 2012: 34). Among these „visible minorities“ three communities stand out in size: Turks, Surinamese and Moroccans, each numbering between 350,000 and 400,000. The Turkish and the Moroccan communities are legacies of the so-called „guest worker“ policies in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Most migrants from Surinam arrived in the 1970s, when this former Dutch colony acquired political independence. The end of the Cold War led to a significant growth of East European migrants and of asylum seekers, some of whom later acquired refugee status. Besides, growing numbers of Dutch and foreign residents find their spouses in other countries. In recent years, the number of highly skilled migrant workers has also increased, although many of them do not settle for good. Meanwhile, follow-up migration among the three largest communities, the Turks, the Surinamese and the Moroccans, is continuing, albeit at a much slower pace than before (Entzinger, 2010).

The development of Dutch immigrant integration policy at the national level is marked by discontinuity (Entzinger, 2006). According to Scholten 'Minorities Policy' in the 1980s had distinct multiculturalist traits, 'Integration Policy' in the 1990s had more universalist traits and, finally, the so-called 'Integration Policy New Style' as pursued since the turn of the millennium had distinct assimilationist traits (Scholten, 2011a: 75-76). Entzinger (2010) argues that the dominant idea in Dutch integration policy has now become that migrants are to blame for their slow integration. Therefore, efforts to step up this process should come from their side. Some lip service is being paid to the idea that integration should be two-sided and that the established population should also leave some space to the newcomers, but only few concrete policy measures in the past decade have pointed in that direction. There is a general understanding that most of the new measures taken in the past ten years leave little or no room for a public recognition of the migrants' cultural identity (Entzinger,

2010). Although the Netherlands has long been celebrated for its successful multiculturalist policies, this multiculturalist approach is widely dismissed as a failure nowadays in Dutch public and political discourse (ibid.). However, remarkable differences in approach exist between the national and the local levels. While at the national level we observe a radical turn from multiculturalism to assimilationism, this turn has been much less obvious locally (Poppelaars & Scholten, 2008: 339). This may have to do with differing responsibilities at these two levels of governance. Moreover, national policies tend to be formulated at a higher level of abstraction than local policies, since it is primarily at the latter level where concrete issues have to be solved.

The three main levels of government in the Netherlands are the national level, the provincial level, and the municipal level. The country has 12 provinces and over 400 municipalities. Since provincial governments concern themselves mainly with areas such as environmental management, spatial planning, and recreation, that level is not very relevant in the field of immigrant integration. The municipal or local level, on the other hand, is extremely relevant, and increasingly so, as there is a trend towards devolution of responsibilities from the national to the local level, particularly in the field of social policy. Municipal authorities in the Netherlands deal with many policy fields, such as traffic, housing, social services, health care, sports, culture, water supply, and public schooling. These activities are largely funded through the national government; local taxes only provide a small part of a municipality's budget. The main political actors at the local stage are the mayor, the aldermen (or deputy-mayors), and the municipal (or city) council. The Netherlands is one of very few European countries where mayors are not elected, but formally appointed by the national government, though the government usually follows the preference expressed by the municipal council (the „local parliament“). The mayor is the head of the local government, which consists of the mayor and the aldermen, i.e. the municipal executive. The mayor is politically responsible for safety and public order in the municipality. The aldermen hold responsibility for all other policy fields, such as economic affairs or education. They are elected by the municipal council and therefore have a stronger political mandate than the mayor has. As the electoral system at the local level is one of proportional representation – as is also the case at the national level – it happens rarely that one single party obtains a majority in a municipal council. Consequently, Dutch municipalities nearly always are governed by coalitions of several parties.

In this country report we will focus specifically on the activities of certain local authorities in the Netherlands in the area of integration of people with an immigrant background. The emphasis will be on ways of promoting attitude changes among the population as a whole. We will analyse the role of local leadership in these processes, assess the outcomes of local efforts and try to find out what specific factors have determined the success of these efforts, or, if applicable, their lack of success. Finally, we will try to draw some lessons from the cases we have studied, and see to what extent these lessons may be transferable to other cities.

Before presenting the results of our study we need to make one more observation regarding terminology. Unlike many other immigration countries in Europe, citizenship is not generally considered the primary distinguishing factor between migrants and the native population in the Netherlands. Rather, ethnic origin tends to be more relevant as a means of differentiating between ‘them’ and ‘us’, not just in the public perception, but also in policy making. The Dutch have even constructed a term for this: the Greek-based word *allochtonen* refers to those people whose ethnic roots lie outside the Netherlands and who, for that reason, can be differentiated from *autochtonen*, the native Dutch. An interesting, but unresolved question is whether an *allochtoon* can ever become *autochtoon* and, if so, at what stage in the integration process, or even after how many generations (Entzinger 2010). The statistical category *niet-westerse allochtonen* includes both first-generation migrants and persons born in the Netherlands, but with at least one parent born in a „non-Western“ country, i.e. in Africa, Central and South America, Asia (excluding Indonesia and Japan) or Turkey (CBS, 2008). It should be noted that the term *allochtonen* is not uncontested and controversy surrounding the concept has led several municipalities to abolish the use of the term in recent years.

## 2. Activities of local authorities

As in most European countries, the immigrant share in the population of Dutch cities differs considerably from one place to another. Such differences largely result from historic immigration patterns, often determined by economic opportunities. It is evident that in cities with large immigrant populations issues related to diversity, integration and social cohesion will be higher on the political agenda than in cities that house relatively few immigrants. Policy objectives and policy instruments may also differ along with the size of the immigrant population, not in the last place because migrants potentially have a bigger say in local elections as their share in the local population goes up. A specific feature of the Netherlands is that non-Dutch residents who have been living in the country for more than five years also have active and passive voting rights in local elections.

With this in mind we have studied seven Dutch cities for the AMICALL study, which differ considerably not only in size, but also in the immigrant share in their populations. Another relevant criterion in the Netherlands is whether a city is part of the Randstad conurbation in the Western part of the country – where almost half of the Netherlands’ population and much of its economic activity are concentrated – or whether it is situated in a more peripheral, slightly less urbanised part of the country. For AMICALL we have chosen the following municipalities: Amsterdam (767,000 inhabitants, of whom 35 % are *niet-westers allochtoon*), Rotterdam (593,000; 37 % *nwa*), Utrecht (300,000; 21 % *nwa*), Enschede (154,000; 18 % *nwa*), Arnhem (147,000; 18 % *nwa*), Delft (100,000; 17 % *nwa*) and Leeuwarden (93,000; 9 % *nwa*). Amsterdam and Rotterdam are not only the largest two

cities in the country, but also have a substantially larger immigrant population than any other city in the country (even though The Hague, the third most populous city, comes close). This is one reason why we have also chosen these two for the in-depth case studies. Another reason for this was that Amsterdam and Rotterdam have pursued rather contrasting policies regarding their immigrant populations over the years (Uitermark, 2010). Both Amsterdam and Rotterdam are part of the Randstad conurbation, and so are Utrecht and Delft. The other three cities are outside the Randstad. Yet, Enschede and Arnhem both have considerable immigrant populations, a heritage of the fact that manufacturing industries in these cities recruited large numbers of 'guest workers', mainly from Turkey, in the 1960s and 1970s. This was not so much the case in Leeuwarden, capital of the Northern province of Fryslân/Friesland, which has a much lower immigrant share.

Given the size of their immigrant communities it is not surprising that Amsterdam as well as Rotterdam have taken some major initiatives in the past years to promote good relations between all members of their populations. The most significant recent initiative in Rotterdam was the 'Dialogues on Urban Citizenship', which took place in the years 2007-2009. These dialogues were organised bottom-up, which means that the local civil society and even individual citizens could suggest themes and ideas to be discussed in group sessions. More than 250 of such group sessions took place, reaching over 15,000 individuals of many different backgrounds. Themes discussed included raising children, employment, education, citizenship, religion and shared values. A more detailed description of this initiative has been given in another AMICALL report.

Amsterdam developed an even more ambitious programme, called 'We Amsterdammers'. It ran from 2004 until 2009, and cost 17.7 million euros. It was launched immediately after the killing of film maker Theo van Gogh in November 2004, in an effort by the authorities to contain social tensions in the city that might have risen after this murder, and to prevent radicalisation of Muslim youngsters. Gradually the programme became much broader and began to focus more and more on improving conditions for integration and promoting social cohesion, seen as crucial factors to prevent radicalisation and polarisation. This initiative too has been described in more detail in another AMICALL report.

In both Amsterdam and Rotterdam local authorities strive towards good network contacts in their cities. Our respondents in both cities keep on stressing the need for local authorities to have good contacts with migrant communities. This is interesting in the context of AMICALL, because it assumes that attitudes to migrants are to be influenced *via* those migrants themselves. When asked about the role of the city in relation to attitudes to migrants the answers of representatives of Amsterdam and Rotterdam seem to boil down to the following: the local government tries to improve the integration of immigrants and their children and to solve integration-related problems first and foremost. If these efforts are successful, public attitudes towards them will improve accordingly. The same holds for the

other Dutch AMICALL cities. This line of reasoning gives an interesting twist to AMICALL's theoretical starting point, as depicted below.

### **AMICALL's underlying theory**

Local leadership => attitudes to migrants => integration
--

### **How Dutch cities interpret their own role**

Local leadership => integration => attitudes to migrants
--

Put simply, AMICALL set out to investigate whether local and regional authorities in Europe can have a direct positive impact on attitudes to migrants (in particular via strategic communication). If this were possible, they might achieve better 'objective' integration outcomes by manipulating an element of the 'subjective' dimension. Dutch cities, however, including Amsterdam and Rotterdam, mainly focus on 'objective' integration indicators (such as language, labour market, education and housing) and issues perceived to be integration-related (such as youngsters hanging around (*hangjongeren*), crime rates, radicalisation, and intolerance towards gays). In other words, even though the Dutch AMICALL cities report a wide range of formalised practices with the intention or the effect of changing attitudes to migrants, the thrust of their approach is to create the right circumstances or necessary preconditions for positive mutual perceptions.

Notwithstanding the former, the interviews, the workshop, and the available documents show that both Rotterdam and Amsterdam are also engaged in a range of communications activities aimed at influencing attitudes to migrants. Many communications activities identified in the literature (see Gidley, 2011: 14) are or have been undertaken by the local governments in both cities: for example place-shaping/place-branding activities, multicultural festivals, public information campaigns, (deputy) mayoral statements, ceremonies or awards aimed at putting across a message, and communication strategies to support specific integration or citizenship projects, such as the 'Dialogues on Urban Citizenship' in Rotterdam or the 'We Amsterdammers' programme, both of which have already been mentioned. It should be noted, though, that most of these communications activities have a broader objective than merely influencing attitudes. Furthermore, notwithstanding the years of experience with most of these activities in both cities, there is no organisational entity within the governments that has an overview of all of them – let alone a unit that *directs* these activities.

Both Amsterdam and Rotterdam are also engaged in *place-shaping/place-branding* activities. In Amsterdam, the slogan "I amsterdam" (<http://www.iamsterdam.com/>) is used as a heading for all *city marketing* activities. In Rotterdam, the slogan "Rotterdam World Port World City" (<http://www.rotterdam.nl/>) is used. In both cases, though, the desire to influence attitudes to migrants only plays a (very) minor role.



Both cities subsidise *multicultural festivals* to a limited extent, i.e. festivals aimed at celebrating the diversity amongst the population or at improving the attitudes towards specific groups. In Rotterdam, they fit in the government's general ambition to be a 'City of Events', because large-scale happenings generate income and 'put Rotterdam on the map'. The Summer Carnival is a case in point. It should be noted that commercial partners do most of the financing of such large events and that the government's role is primarily facilitating (security, traffic control etc). The linkage with the current citizenship agenda is weak. The Amsterdam government financed a number of festivals under the 'We Amsterdammers' programme. Some of them still exist, some of them are now financed by private parties only, and some no longer exist.

*Networking* is seen as a crucial instrument not only in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, but also in the other Dutch AMICALL cities. As one expert during the Technical Workshop put it: "the network is the basis for preventing anything". This was confirmed during the Round Table: cities aim at keeping in touch with all citizens by encouraging urban dialogues, both between the local government and the citizens and between different groups of the population. Concomitant to this, a consensus emerged during the workshop that city governments should try to involve not only neighbourhoods or city districts in their policies, but also individual streets (i.e. the street level).

The City of Delft, for example, not only subsidises a number of migrant associations with a small yearly amount and supports them with housing facilities in the neighbourhoods. The city also invests in direct personal contacts with local employees and directors of these migrant associations: "In return, these associations have to be representative for their community and contribute to the local integration policy. The municipality demands their contribution in local problems. ... [also] we expect them to invest in good communication with the local government and civil organizations in town" (City of Delft, 2012).

In practice, according to the Deputy Mayor of Delft, the emphasis on networking "means that I talk and arrange a lot with the boards and members of these associations. In the same way, many of my employees do. They often attend meetings and activities of migrant organizations. As a result, these people are quicker in contacting the municipality when they notice problems or see opportunities" (City of Delft, 2012).

The City of Delft believes that "the decisive factor is personal, oral contact, more than any communications product whatsoever" (City of Delft in response to AMICALL survey).

A variety of activities is also being organised in the other Dutch AMICALL cities. It is noteworthy that three out of nine communications activities shortlisted for AMICALL are

reported by all seven cities: (*multicultural*) *festivals, speeches and visits of the mayor and/or the responsible alderman, and welcome packages or ceremonies for newcomers (immigrants)*. With regard to this last activity this is not surprising, as municipalities are nowadays required by law to organise naturalisation ceremonies. In some cities, the end of a civic integration course is also marked by a ceremony. Both Delft and Enschede underline the importance of personal visits by persons in authority. In the relevant policy document, the city of Enschede explains:

"Knowing each other is a prerequisite and the key to integration. In various ways the municipality wishes to encourage both exchange of knowledge and contacts. ... Twice a year a meeting is organised, led by the mayor, between the different cultures in the city. These meetings will be different in terms of form and substance. They may be about discussing a concrete issue, but also about a cultural encounter. ... Ad-hoc encounters between *allochtonen* and *autochtonen* do not lead to mutual understanding and sympathy automatically. There are numerous local initiatives in which population groups meet each other, but they are temporary and are often being organised around ethnic differences. We are aiming at topics that concern all people in Enschede structurally" (City of Enschede, 2008: 39).

In this quote, one can see various elements that are also visible in other cities (including Amsterdam and Rotterdam): a move away from the distinction between *allochtonen* and *autochtonen*, a move towards generic topics that concern all citizens, and a recognition that individual contacts, especially ad-hoc contacts, do not lead to better mutual perceptions automatically. Also, as in the other cities, the personal leadership of the local government officials and durable network contacts are emphasised.

Enschede is the only city that uses *city marketing/city branding* partly with the aim of improving attitudes to migrants. It should be noted, though, that the framing of the initial AMICALL question leaves open the possibility that the other cities may also use city marketing/branding, but may not perceive a link with attitudes to migrants.

The picture with regards to *diversity awards* is mixed: Leeuwarden no longer has an anti-racism prize, whilst Enschede is developing a diversity award.

Interestingly, the three cities outside of the Randstad report *information campaigns about diversity in the local population*, whereas the cities that are part of the Randstad do not. Of course, for reasons of representativeness no strong conclusions can be drawn from this correlation, but one could tentatively infer that diversity in the Randstad is accepted as a given, whereas in the more rural provinces it is more often seen as a relatively new and unknown phenomenon.

It is harder to interpret the different answers with regard to *providing information to counter the formation of myths and misunderstandings*, though the Utrecht case should be briefly elaborated.

In Utrecht a highly publicised incident that also received national media attention occurred around the time the AMICALL survey was held: a gay couple decided to leave their neighbourhood, while blaming the Utrecht mayor for insufficiently protecting them against harassment by Dutch-Moroccan youngsters. There was also another incident in Utrecht concerning a Roma family (who, as the local government has acknowledged, are not immigrants). In the (national) media, it was suggested that this family had been given an expensive house by the city of Utrecht. In the survey, the Utrecht government indicated that the communications policy with regard to these incidents had received a lot of attention within the local public administration, but that the incidents had not led to any change in that policy. It is likely that these incidents linked up several communications activities included in our survey: providing information to counter the formation of myths and misunderstandings, speeches and visits of the mayor and/or the responsible alderman, and symbolic statements, for example by the mayor or in the city council.

The city of Enschede is the only one out of the five local governments outside Amsterdam and Rotterdam to report both *strategic co-operation with (local) media* and *co-ordination of communications activities by a special unit of the local government*. By contrast, all cities indicate that they have initiated, supported or subsidised activities aimed at influencing attitudes towards migrants. The City of Leeuwarden, for example, distinguishes between direct activities - such as subsidising an anti-discrimination bureau, information campaigns, publications in regional newspapers on migrants who successfully attended integration courses, or supporting employers' meetings on diversity and interculturalisation – and indirect activities. Examples of the latter are the launching of a diversity policy in the local public administration itself, investing in a multi-functional centre called "The Connection", with a multicultural team, and promoting a project line called "civic integration in the neighbourhood". The Leeuwarden case shows that a multi-faceted approach towards attitudes to migrants is not exclusive to the large cities in the West of the country. In this context, it is noteworthy that immigrants in Leeuwarden more often have a refugee background than in the Randstad cities (City of Leeuwarden, 2008).

The Leeuwarden approach is increasingly characterised by an emphasis on participation of all citizens (City of Leeuwarden, 2008). This is also the case in other cities. The historical development that led to this shift is briefly sketched by the City of Arnhem:

"Until 2003 the City of Arnhem subsidised self-organisations [of *allochtonen*]. They received money to organise activities with their supporters. The AFS replaced this [AFS: *Arnhems Fonds Samenlevingsbeleid*, i.e. the Arnhem Fund for Society Policy]. The vision about integration changed in the direction that *allochtonen* and *autochtonen* should do activities together to promote the integration. At this moment there is a new vision document "Integration through participation" [City of Arnhem, 2011]). It has as a red line that no target groups policy is implemented anymore; the new philosophy is 'generic when possible and specific when needed'. Integration will be promoted by encouraging everyone's active participate in society" (City of Arnhem, AMICALL survey response).

In previous periods, the City of Delft organised a broad package of intercultural communication and encounters. The aim of these activities was that residents with differing backgrounds would get to know each other better (City of Delft, 2012). The current philosophy is slightly different, however. It resembles the one in Rotterdam and Amsterdam in the sense that it gives a twist to AMICALL's theoretical starting point: attitudes towards migrants are to be influenced via integration, instead of the other way round:

Since a few years, we have given civil society, and especially migrant organizations or associations, the responsibility to organise these intercultural encounters. This is not only for financial reasons. We believe in the power of the people and want to appeal to their knowledge and skills, as a method of empowerment. We look for opportunities. We would like people to be involved and encourage them in organizing networks, to experience, to take part in networks etc. When possible, we subsidise activities with a small amount of money. This is because we think that activities based on empowerment are important and by subsidising certain activities we want to give a boost to these inspirations/actions. In the long term, participation in the Delft society also leads to better attitudes towards migrants. Our philosophy is: *be good and show it*, also to native residents. Open your mosque, be hospitable, invite neighbours, offer your facilities to other citizens, co-operate with churches in the area, social and commercial institutions etc. We stimulate an open mind and encourage migrants to interact with their native neighbours" (City of Delft, 2012, emphasis added).

Still, the City of Delft acknowledges the two-sided character of integration. As noted by the deputy mayor of Delft, in the current national political climate: "public and politicians like a tough policy on immigration and integration themes. More than ever, newcomers have to make efforts to meet the demands of the country where they make a living. But I prefer a more balanced policy: keeping up hospitality and a warm welcome is not old-fashioned" (City of Delft, 2012).

### **3. Leadership and planning process**

There is ample research evidence that a sizeable group of native Dutch citizens are unhappy about immigration and its effects. Long-term trend data indicate a rather sudden rise of feelings of uneasiness around the turn of the millennium, when immigration was very high and dissatisfaction with the still dominant multiculturalist approach was growing. Negative feelings were strongest in the turbulent early years of the 2000s, following the international and national events surrounding 9/11. In the Netherlands there was the rise of anti-immigration politician Pim Fortuyn, who was killed shortly before the May 2002 elections by an animal-rights activist who thought Fortuyn was 'a danger', as well as the murder of filmmaker Theo van Gogh by a Muslim fundamentalist in November 2004. More recently, opinions appear to have taken a somewhat more positive turn, even though this has not altered the fact that a substantial proportion of the native Dutch population holds negative opinions about migrants. No fewer than 40% of the Dutch, for example, think that there are too many people of a different nationality living in the Netherlands (SCP, 2009: 28-29). In general, highly educated indigenous Dutch citizens are more positive in their views about non-Western migrants than those at lower educational levels (SCP, 2009: 29).

Feelings of uneasiness and dissatisfaction have also become manifest at the political level, with Geert Wilders' Freedom Party (PVV) as the most outspoken expression of this. In the 2010 parliamentary elections this party was favoured by about one-sixth of the national electorate. It supported the coalition government of Conservative liberals (VVD) and Christian-democrats (CDA) that was formed after these elections, without however becoming part of it. The price for this support was a much stricter immigration policy and a tougher integration policy for immigrants already present in the country. The coalition government fell after eighteen months in office, and new elections have been called for September 2012. Even though the latest coalition government has been unable to fulfil most of its promises concerning migration and integration, it has had set a much harsher tone on these issues, not only at the national level, but also locally. More than before, citizens expect local authorities to take integration seriously, and to come up with effective measures. This requires good and effective local leadership.

Rotterdam may be the city where local leadership is needed most of all. Although the immigrant share in its population is very similar to that in Amsterdam, its economic conditions are less favourable than in the country's capital, which constitutes an additional challenge to any integration policy. Actually, local politics in Rotterdam have been dominated for the past ten years already by a struggle between the social-democratic Labour Party (PvdA), traditionally dominant in that city, and the late Pim Fortuyn's Liveable Rotterdam Party, which entered the City Council in the 2002 elections, where it came out first, and which has been a significant force in the city ever since. Most experts in Rotterdam

interviewed for AMICALL preferred to call Liveable Rotterdam an anti-establishment party, rather than anti-immigrant. However, the party is very critical of any policy that treats immigrants differently at the expense of the native population, its major constituency. This, of course, is an additional challenge for any Rotterdam local government wishing to promote good inter-ethnic relations. In the years 2002-2006 Liveable Rotterdam was part of the local coalition government. Since then they have been in the opposition, but following local integration policy with great attention. This even more so since Mr Ahmed Aboutaleb of the Labour Party was appointed mayor of Rotterdam in 2009. He migrated from Morocco when he was a youngster, and he is also a Muslim. This makes his position as a local leader not an easy one.

In Amsterdam the situation may seem a little easier: there is no strong anti-multiculturalist or anti-establishment party in that city and the economic outlook is better than in Rotterdam. Nevertheless, the Van Gogh murder in 2004 provoked serious tensions in the capital, which could be contained by the then mayor Mr Job Cohen, who had a very accommodating attitude towards integration, and his deputy, Mr Aboutaleb, now mayor of Rotterdam. Before he became the mayor of Amsterdam, Mr Cohen was the deputy minister of Justice, especially charged with immigration. The current mayor of Amsterdam is Mr Eberhard van der Laan, also of the Labour Party, and previously minister for Integration in the national government. Thus, local leadership in both cities is in the hands of politicians who are quite experienced in the field of inter-ethnic relations. This almost seems imperative for a successful policy in this most delicate field.

Our AMICALL findings confirmed the need for leadership and specific expertise in the field of integration and ethnic relations. During the workshop, a discussion took place on the phenomenon of 'white anger' (*'witte woede'*), a relatively recent term to describe attitudes to migrants in the Dutch context. In the summer of 2010, two expert institutes (FORUM and the Verwey-Jonker Instituut) published a research project on the topic. The paper defined 'white anger' as "the voice of the angry native citizen who no longer has confidence in the government and who is angry at 'foreigners'" (De Gruyter et al., 2010). Recently, the Amsterdam Advisory Council for Diversity and Integration (ADI) was asked by the local government to formulate an advice on the issue. Even though no official representative of either Amsterdam or Rotterdam used containing 'white anger' as an explicit objective of their governments' activities, it could be that some political decisions in this domain are influenced by the desire to prevent non-migrants from getting (more) angry at the authorities and at migrants. For example: parts of the 'We Amsterdammers' programme were explicitly focused on specific groups (like Moroccan Amsterdammers, many of whom are children or grandchildren of immigrants), rather than on the population at large or even the population without an immigrant background (Van Straalen & Liem, 2009). In terms of the AMICALL project, the theory of change underlying these parts seems to boil down to the idea that 'immigrants whose radicalisation has been prevented will be perceived more positively'.

According to one expert who participated in the Dutch AMICALL Technical Workshop, local governments throughout the Netherlands are nowadays keen on preventing ‘white anger’ and this is one of the reasons for them to prefer generic policies to target group policies. Concentrating policy attention on an *entire* neighbourhood, rather than on specific communities is a case in point. Organising targeted activities such as swimming or cycling lessons especially for Moroccan women are to be avoided, in this expert’s view, so as to prevent ‘white anger’. In relation to this, another expert noted that some activities potentially generate a lot of media exposure, such as subsidising Ramadan festivities: “why is their food being paid for?”. To prevent such negative reactions any local government, in this expert’s view, should refrain from organising a Ramadan festival itself. Instead, facilitating such a festival in a more subtle way, for example by giving permission to the organisers to hold it on a prestigious square, is to be preferred.

A constant challenge to leadership is the fact that in the Netherlands, local governments, just like the national government, always are coalitions of several parties, often three or more. Sometimes their composition may seem surprising from a national perspective (e.g. a coalition including both Conservative-Liberals and the Green-Left). In these circumstances, any activity in this politically delicate area may have to be ‘sold’ differently to different audiences, which is a potential threat to consistency in policy making. Consistency may be hampered not only at the political level, but also at the bureaucratic level. According to various experts, the sheer size and departmental structure of the local governmental apparatus make it difficult for cities the size of Amsterdam and Rotterdam to communicate a single uniform message about attitudes to migrants. In other words, even if local politicians would agree on a single uniform message, delivering it to the public in a consistent manner is a huge challenge in itself. This may be less problematic in smaller municipalities.

#### **4. Outcomes**

Much of the outcomes of local initiatives in Dutch cities presented in this report were already addressed in section 2, where these activities were described. This is particularly so for the medium-sized cities, where a systematic evaluation is often lacking. Only the largest initiatives presented in this report have been evaluated systematically. In the cities covered by AMICALL this has been the case in Amsterdam and Rotterdam.

The outcomes of the ‘Dialogues on Urban Citizenship’ programme in Rotterdam, for example, have been assessed internally, that is by the local government branch that also organised the programme, in a detailed report to the City Council (JOS, 2010). That report states that, in general terms, the dialogues not only provided a podium for the canalisation of emotions, but also constituted a first step in the search for a sense of community among

Rotterdammers (“What makes Rotterdam ‘our city’?”). More specifically, four outcomes are mentioned. First, during the dialogues, the importance of knowing the Dutch language was reaffirmed as a necessary precondition for participating as a citizen. Secondly, it has turned out that Rotterdammers no longer wish to use the term *allochtonen* because of its negative connotation, because it emphasises a distinction that people wish to overcome, and because it is too much of a generalisation. Thirdly, in the dialogues on ‘shared values’ it was concluded that many values are in fact shared. However, under awkward circumstances (exclusion, discrimination or feelings of insecurity) individuals become insufficiently aware of this (JOS, 2010: 83-84). Finally, newcomers suffer from negative reports in the media. Some people feel that the local government itself should disseminate positive stories, but others argue that it is more effective if the government only facilitates positive story telling by Rotterdammers themselves.

Since the ‘Dialogues on Urban Citizenship’ programme local policies in Rotterdam appear to have been based consistently on two pillars. One is an emphasis on the need for participation of *all* citizens, immigrants and non-immigrants alike, in local society. The other one is a ‘zero tolerance’ stance in issues of discrimination, public safety, and refusal to participate. In the latter case, for example, social benefits may be withdrawn from anyone unwilling to accept a job offer or to follow an education trajectory (College van B&W Rotterdam, 2011).

In Amsterdam, several parts of the ‘We Amsterdammers’ initiative have also been evaluated systematically - though also mainly internally - particularly those related to preventing radicalisation, the first broad policy objective of the initiative. The evaluation report identifies three success factors (Van Straalen & Liem, 2009: 4): winning trust comes before taking action, responsible authorities should be committed, and the involvement of thematic experts is important. One of the outcomes of the ‘We Amsterdammers’ programme has been the formation of new urban networks. However, these did not always last and those that did last not always had a concrete output in the form of follow-up activities (ibid.: 4). The local Advisory Council for Diversity and Integration (*Adviesraad Diversiteit en Integratie*: ADI) indicates that some of the organised events have led to new positive contacts across group boundaries (ibid.: 4-5). But it is difficult to assess the effects of meetings on attitudes, the Council notes. The evaluation of the ‘We Amsterdammers’ programme, especially of the various experiments at the neighbourhood level, has underlined the conviction that social cohesion is a complicated process that needs an integrated and systematic approach, involving for example youth and educational policies as well. Once-off events such as neighbourhood barbecues are no longer believed to promote social cohesion sustainably, a conclusion that was also drawn by the Netherlands Institute of Social Research in an evaluation of neighbourhood activities in Dutch cities that aim at promoting integration (SCP, 2011). The main lessons of the ‘We Amsterdammers’ programme have been incorporated into the more integrated approach of ‘Citizenship and Diversity’ (*Burgerschap*



*en Diversiteit*), which has characterised local policies in the last few years, particularly since the current local government took office in 2010.

## 5. Factors influencing outcomes

The effectiveness of local integration initiatives depends on a variety of factors. The most important ones were discussed at the Technical Workshop and the Round Table organised under AMICALL, but several factors were also mentioned in the interviews with local stakeholders. In the workshop consensus appeared that what happens at the *national level* is crucial for the local level. If the national integration debate promotes negative attitudes to migrants this can act as a barrier to positive changes in attitudes at the local level. In fact, some argue that attitudes to migrants are primarily formed at the national level. Indirectly, this may impact local attitudes. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that local attempts to change attitudes are in vain. It could also lead to the conclusion that local governments should try to influence the national debate first and foremost. Of course the potential impact of cities in this debate strongly depends on their size: large cities usually find a more willing ear to their needs in national politics than smaller ones, even though the latter, of course, may join their efforts, if needed, for example through the Netherlands Association of Local Authorities (VNG).

Given the need for budget austerity the amount of *money* made available for local integration policies by the national government has been diminishing. In 2013, for example, there will be no budget any more for civic integration courses at the local level, because the national government wishes immigrants to pay for these courses themselves. Budget cuts also occur in related domains like education, which makes it very difficult for cities to shift funds from one budget chapter to another. During the Dutch Round Table it was noted that in the current economic climate the leverage of Dutch cities to deviate from national policy lines really is compromised. Budget cuts have become a serious constraint for cities in their pursuit of innovative and effective integration and communication policies regarding migrants. There is a chance, however, that the budget cuts will be mitigated somewhat, depending on the outcomes of the national elections due for September 2012.

In the literature (see Gidley, 2011), it is argued that connecting attitudes towards migrants with *security* issues usually negatively affects those attitudes. One Dutch expert consulted for AMICALL gave a different view on this linkage. In the early 2000s the Dutch authorities were keen on collecting more information with respect to 'radical' Muslim migrants (and their children) out of security concerns. To do so, they tried to link up with the 'moderate' majority of the Muslim population. In this observer's view, the inclusive language on citizenship was partly a result of this endeavour. If this interpretation is correct, the issue linkage between security and migrant integration may indeed have emphasised

commonalities in some cases, but in other cases it may have accentuated differences, particularly within migrant communities.

Another expert noted that outcomes of local initiatives may be affected by the fact that the *media landscape* has become much more complex and erratic. Use of twitter, for example, enabled aldermen to share their own personal views on certain issues with others even *during* meetings of the local government. This view must not necessarily be in line with official local policy and this may lead to confusion. In other words: the new social media make it easier for local governments to speak with several mouths instead of one. Actually, this observation points at a more general issue, already raised in section 3, which has to do with coherence and consistency in policies and in communication about these policies. Some improvements have been made in this respect. Until recently, for example, each Ministry and each National Agency had its own logo, and so did each branch of local government in the major cities. The fact that this has been streamlined now does not imply, however, that policy initiatives have been streamlined as well. The fact that local governments in the Netherlands are always coalitions of several parties with diverging interests, combined with the fact that bureaucracies tend to pursue their own logic, may generate confusing messages with a negative impact on policy outcomes.

Conversely, it should be noted that even a large city like Amsterdam could more or less ‘inadvertently’ deliver a uniform message, even if no organisational unit is actively ‘pulling the strings’. As one expert interviewed for AMICALL notes, there seems to be a kind of natural alignment between Amsterdam’s activities to attract highly skilled, cosmopolitan newcomers (based on Richard Florida’s notion of the ‘creative class’), the city’s campaign to fight discrimination, its multicultural festivals, and the diversity policy in the different parts of the municipal bureaucracy charged with the implementation of these varying policies. Without necessarily being conscious of it, according to that expert, all officials engaged in these activities contribute to the image of Amsterdam as an open, diversity-friendly city that rewards individual talent. Ideally, of course, the slogan “I amsterdam” binds these positive connotations together (and might become as well-known as the “I love NY” icon). In Rotterdam, various experts note that different structural characteristics make it more difficult to position the city as an attractive domicile for businesses and persons alike. The country’s second city is characterised by industrial decline, its economy is less service-oriented than Amsterdam’s and its housing stock less attractive for middle and high-income groups.

Finally, several participants in AMICALL activities have remarked that the successes of local initiatives to change attitudes towards migrants may also be affected by international events. An obvious example are the 9/11 attacks in 2001, but the election of Barack Obama as president of the United States is said to have had a positive impact on interethnic relations in Dutch cities, as it showed that an African American was able to access the

highest office in the country (Van Straalen & Liem, 2009: 17). Conversely, it has been reported that the Middle East conflict, when discussed at schools with large Muslim populations, may increase tensions. Paying special attention to the Arab Spring events in 2011 mitigated these tensions. Briefly, world politics do have an impact on outcomes of local efforts to change attitudes.

## 6. Learning

One challenge highlighted in all AMICALL interviews with senior policy advisers is the need to link up the concrete stories and concerns of individual citizens (at the street and neighbourhood levels) with the larger issues the city as a whole is facing (see also JOS, 2010: 82). Making the step from individual concerns to larger policy issues is not always easy, but it is decisive for the success of a project. The language issue is a case in point: native people could help immigrants who live in the same street or neighbourhood to learn Dutch. In the same move, they would get to know each other better. In the Rotterdam 'Dialogues on Urban Citizenship', for example, immigrants signalled that they would like to improve their knowledge of Dutch, both through formal education and by practising. Yet, a big issue remains how to engage citizens who are relatively isolated and/or distrustful of their fellow citizens and the authorities (JOS, 2010: 84).

Emphasising shared citizenship may be a good objective for local policies. However, as one of the experts interviewed for AMICALL argued, the concept of 'citizenship' itself may not be so useful as a communicative tool, because it is too abstract for the average citizen. Shared citizenship, therefore, should be interpreted as stressing similarities rather than differences between local inhabitants. A major conclusion of the Rotterdam dialogues was that ethnic labelling should be dropped (JOS, 2010: 83). First, because local populations have become so diverse that differentiating between just two labels ('immigrant and non-immigrant' or *allochtonen* and *autochtonen*) can no longer be justified. Secondly, because a person's cultural and ethnic background is just one element of his or her personality. And thirdly, the idea of diversity as positive characteristic of the city requires a focus on the contribution of individual citizens, rather than on that of groups or categories (JOS, 2010: 84-85).

Experience in Amsterdam points in a similar direction. The 'We Amsterdammers' programme was also aimed at promoting a sense of local citizenship among all city residents. Only certain parts of the programme were explicitly focused on specific groups (such as Moroccan Amsterdammers, many of whom are children or grandchildren of immigrants), rather than on the population at large or the population without an immigrant background. Another lesson from the 'We Amsterdammers' evaluation report is that there must be a good balance between 'talking' and 'doing' (Van Straalen & Liem, 2009: 5). "In the first phase right after the shock of the murder of Theo van Gogh a desire existed to meet

each other and to enter into conversation. After that, the desire for meetings aimed at 'doing something' came up, thus encouraging a more active form of citizenship" (ibid.: 5).

Formally, both Rotterdam and Amsterdam have abolished target groups policies (*doelgroepenbeleid*). Several experts interviewed acknowledge that the policies-formerly-known-as-integration-policies are now being directed at all citizens. The current philosophy is based on the idea that the policies should move beyond "thinking in terms of 'us' and 'them'". As a Rotterdam expert argued: "the mainstream has become diverse" and therefore the city focuses on "all Rotterdammers". At the same time, the idea that the population can be meaningfully divided in different groups has not completely gone. As one Amsterdam expert puts it: "It doesn't mean that we only have generic policies".

Perhaps the most important lesson to be drawn from Dutch local experiences is that any policy that aims at improving attitudes towards migrants should address the entire population, and not just one or a few categories. In both Amsterdam and Rotterdam, the deputy mayors responsible for these policies purposely refrain from using the term *allochtonen* in their communication with the general public. In fact, both officials do not like to use this controversial term at all. The political rationale is that the words *allochtoon* and *autochtoon* in their view stress differences rather than similarities. Instead, both cities try to emphasise what people have in common in their current approach; hence the emphasis on citizenship. In Amsterdam, different 'ethnic' groups (that is *allochtoon* according to the definition of Statistics Netherlands) are consistently described with hyphenated labels (even though the hyphen is not needed in the Dutch language): Moroccan Amsterdammers, Turkish Amsterdammers, etc. This policy has even created a relatively uncommon term: Caribbean Amsterdammers to describe those individuals who are usually called Surinamese or Antillean. The other AMICALL cities also struggle with the word *allochtonen* and the differentiating approach that it reflects. The term can still be found in some policy documents, but mainly in the tables (or in footnotes, explaining that the city uses information provided by Statistics Netherlands). One of the cities consciously chooses to avoid the term. If the word has to be used nonetheless, it is used as an adjective, not as a noun.

The dilemma just described is a broader dilemma, which arises in any situation where equal opportunity of different communities has to be pursued, or where community relations are to be improved. In order to assess change over time, and the impact of policies designed to speed up that change, the categories at stake have to be defined and labelled. Statistical information needs to be collected so as to monitor if change really takes place. The paradox of this is that differences need to be labelled with a view of overcoming these differences in the long run. This is precisely the reason why Netherlands Statistics continues to collect information on *allochtonen* and why national and local authorities continue to make use of these data. The Council for Social Development (RMO), an advisory body to the national

government, recently launched a fundamental debate on this issue, which has certain similarities with debates on affirmative action that have taken place in other countries (RMO, 2012).

From a similar perspective, a final lesson learned from Dutch AMICALL experience is that focusing policies on all citizens (rather than on target groups) may lead to a situation where specific needs of specific groups or barriers they may encounter can be easily overlooked. Cases of ethnic discrimination, for example, may not be recognised any more. Another risk is that migrants without a secure residence status are actually excluded by citizenship-oriented policies. Finally, if ethnicity or migrant status were no longer a relevant factor, the support of migrant associations could also be dismissed. This is a consequence that some local authorities refuse to accept, as, for example, the city of Delft:

“Due to our decreasing financial resources and the growing importance of civil society in general we expect that these associations will play a prominent role in the years to come. Especially for newcomers and vulnerable members of ethnic groups. These organisations are important for a lot of current integration activities, like: introducing and accompanying newcomers of the same ethnic background; offering integration courses (language, health, teaching pupils etc.); organising segments of their community to empower (women, youngsters); showing and exchanging their culture and heritage with Dutch society. We realise that this attitude bears in it the risk of a growing segregation. On the other hand, once newcomers have been educated, they like to gain experiences outside their own community and want to broaden their horizon” (City of Delft, 2012).

The issue whether or not to label communities in order to improve equal citizenship and create a better mutual understanding may very well be one of the most challenging lessons to be learnt from the AMICALL project.

## **7. Conclusion**

Local authorities in the Netherlands have a long tradition of organising and supporting activities that are relevant in the context of the AMICALL project. Major differences can be observed between Amsterdam and Rotterdam, the largest two cities in the country, each with a substantial population of immigrant descent, and other medium-sized cities, where immigrant populations are relatively smaller. Amsterdam and Rotterdam, the cities chosen for the in-depth case studies, both have developed vast programmes that aim at improving conditions for immigrant integration, but also at promoting good relations between local communities as well as at attitude change. One interesting finding is that, based on their long-standing experience, these major cities consider creating good opportunities for

integration and an active participation of all local citizens to be the best way to encourage interaction and to develop more positive attitudes between communities. This seems to contradict the initial idea of AMICALL, where the assumption prevailed that fostering positive attitudes would lead to better integration.

Most of the five medium-sized cities in the Dutch part of AMICALL have a more mixed approach in this respect. They certainly endorse the need for an active integration policy, but they also spend a relatively large part of their energy and budgets on providing information on immigrants to their native citizens, on promoting interaction and on educational and celebratory activities to bring cultures together. This may be explained by the fact that these cities are much less cosmopolitan than Amsterdam and Rotterdam are. Their original populations have less day-to-day experience with immigrants.

All Dutch local authorities on which we have collected data are of the opinion that improving community relations can only be achieved by targeting the local population in its entirety, and not just certain communities, whether native or immigrant. Their hope is that local policies will change people's attitudes as well as their behaviour, but in reality only limited instruments exist to achieve this. Bringing people of different backgrounds together is usually not enough, as this tends to confirm their initial ideas and prejudices. Attitudes and behaviour are more likely to change if members of different communities actually get together in order to achieve something jointly. Stressing cultural difference is not usually a good way of achieving a better mutual understanding. The better alternative is stressing commonalities, such as the fact that everyone is a citizen of the same city.

This requires a broad approach, which is not always easy to co-ordinate, as many sectors of the local administration need to be involved. Equally important is the fact that local authorities should not carry out their policies by themselves: an active involvement of civil society, including migrant and other grassroots organisations seems indispensable. To do this successfully local authorities need an elaborate network of good contacts with local communities that should also be actively involved in policy making. The need for such a network was stressed in all Dutch AMICALL cities.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the anti-immigrant attitudes that currently prevail in Dutch policy-making at the national level are not really mirrored at the local level. On the contrary, there is general awareness that precisely in times of strong anti-immigrant feelings active policies should be pursued in this field, even if budgets are being reduced. The aim of such policies should not be to celebrate cultural diversity, as was the case in the past, but to provide equal opportunities to every individual, irrespective of his or her background. In the Netherlands a consensus appears to be growing among cities that this is the best way towards achieving more positive attitudes and harmonious inter-community relations.

## **Appendix 1: A brief note on methodology**

To protect their anonymity all experts involved in AMICALL (those interviewed and those present during the workshop) have not been mentioned in the report. In-depth interviews were held in Amsterdam and Rotterdam (with eight experts in total). Other methods used were document analysis, a survey (see below), and focus group sessions during the workshop on 25 November 2011. This workshop was hosted by the City of Rotterdam. The other cities involved (to varying degrees) in AMICALL are Utrecht, Delft, Enschede, Arnhem and Leeuwarden. Finally, some key points that were raised or confirmed during the Dutch Round Table conference at Erasmus University Rotterdam, held on 30 January 2012, fed into this Final Country Report as well as into other reports by the Dutch AMICALL team.

Roughly following the format created by the co-ordinating team at Oxford University, the Dutch researchers drafted a survey to get an impression of relevant activities outside of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The survey was sent around to the most relevant other cities in the Netherlands via a contact person at the Dutch Association for Municipalities (VNG: *Vereniging Nederlandse Gemeenten*). The total number of cities in this mailing list, excluding Amsterdam and Rotterdam, was 23. Five cities returned the survey: Arnhem, Delft, Enschede, Leeuwarden, and Utrecht. Two of these five city governments were also represented during the Technical Workshop. Three out of these five city governments were represented during the Round Table. Amsterdam and Rotterdam were represented at both events.

Finally, it should be noted that Dutch societal stakeholders, including a migrant organisation, think tanks, and an anti-discrimination bureau, also attended both the Technical Workshop on 25 November 2011 and the National Round Table on 30 January 2012. Thus, AMICALL Netherlands has succeeded in incorporating the expert opinions not only of policy makers, but also of other relevant actors in the domain of Attitudes to Migrants, Communication and Local Leadership.

## Appendix 2: AMICALL survey The Netherlands (in Dutch)

Den Haag, augustus 2011

Aan: coördinatoren integratiebeleid grotere Nederlandse gemeenten

Betreft: AMICALL vragenlijst

Geachte mevrouw, mijnheer,

De Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam voert in opdracht van de Europese Commissie en met gelden van het Europees Integratiefonds een project uit dat meer licht wil werpen op communicatiestrategieën van lokale overheden op het gebied van integratiebeleid. De titel van het project is AMICALL: *Attitudes to Migrants, Communication and Local Leadership*. Bij het project zijn zes EU-landen betrokken en het wordt gecoördineerd door de Universiteit van Oxford. De Nederlandse projectleider, prof.dr. Han Entzinger, heeft mij benaderd met de vraag of de onderzoekers via de VNG een beroep kunnen doen op de medewerking van een aantal gemeenten. Mij lijkt het project van zodanig belang dat ik medewerking hieraan zeer kan aanbevelen. Graag breng ik het AMICALL-project dan ook onder uw aandacht. Een beknopte nadere toelichting van doelstellingen en werkwijze vindt u in het bijgaande document. Het project is sterk praktijkgericht en beoogt uitwisseling van ervaringen en *best practices*, zowel nationaal als internationaal.

U treft hierbij ook een door de onderzoekers opgestelde beknopte vragenlijst aan met het verzoek deze in te vullen en aan hen te retourneren. Het is de bedoeling via deze vragenlijst een breed beeld te verkrijgen van de communicatie-activiteiten die de grotere Nederlandse gemeenten ondernemen of in de afgelopen jaren hebben ondernomen om de houding van de plaatselijke bevolking m.b.t. de integratie van migranten te beïnvloeden. U kunt hierbij denken aan activiteiten als *city marketing/branding*, het organiseren van festivals, het uitloven van diversiteitspijzen, informatiecampagnes, strategische samenwerking met (lokale) media et cetera. Op basis van de resultaten van dit korte verkennende onderzoek en de door u beschikbaar te stellen documenten (zie hiervoor ook de vragenlijst) zal een beperkt aantal gemeenten worden geselecteerd voor een nadere analyse. Vertegenwoordigers van deze gemeenten zullen ook worden uitgenodigd voor een tweetal workshops (een nationale en een internationale), waarbij ervaringen en *best practices* worden uitgewisseld. Uiteraard zullen de resultaten ook worden gepresenteerd in het eindrapport van AMICALL, dat medio 2012 aan de Europese Commissie wordt aangeboden en daarna zal worden gepubliceerd.

Zoudt u zo vriendelijk willen zijn het bijgaande vragenlijstje te beantwoorden en binnen 14 dagen per e-mail te retourneren aan drs. Stijn Verbeek, onderzoeker van het AMICALL-project aan de Erasmus Universiteit? Zijn e-mailadres is [s.r.verbeek@fsw.eur.nl](mailto:s.r.verbeek@fsw.eur.nl); het postadres is: Drs. Stijn Verbeek, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, onderzoeksgroep CIMIC, Postbus 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam. U kunt drs. Verbeek zo nodig telefonisch bereiken op nr. 010-4088649 of 06-14291192.

Alvast hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking, mede namens prof. Entzinger en de onderzoeksgroep van de Erasmus Universiteit,

[VNG contact person]



Dit zijn de vragen:

1-Onderneemt of subsidieert uw gemeente activiteiten die zijn bedoeld om de publieke meningsvorming over migranten in de gemeente te beïnvloeden? Zo ja, wat voor activiteiten zijn dat? (Ook activiteiten uit het verleden kunnen van belang zijn.)

2-Kunt u bij onderstaande activiteiten aangeven of ze door uw gemeente worden ondernomen of gesubsidieerd, met als doel het beïnvloeden van de houding van burgers ten aanzien van migranten? (Gaarne aangeven met 'ja' of 'nee'.)

-city marketing/city branding

-(multiculturele) festivals

-diversiteitsprijzen

-informatiecampagnes over diversiteit onder de gemeentelijke bevolking

-informatievoorziening om mythevorming en misverstanden tegen te gaan

-toespraken en bezoeken van de burgemeester en/of de verantwoordelijke wethouder

-strategische samenwerking met (lokale) media

-coördinatie van communicatieactiviteiten door een speciale afdeling van de gemeente

-welkomstpakketten of -ceremonieel voor nieuwkomers (immigranten)

-symbolische verklaringen, bijvoorbeeld door de burgemeester of in de gemeenteraad

-andere activiteiten, te weten: .....

.....

.....

3-Is er een specifieke aanleiding voor het organiseren van deze activiteiten? Zo ja, welke?

4-Zijn de activiteiten beschreven in een beleidsplan of ander officieel document? Zo ja, om welk document gaat het hier en zou u dit naar ons toe kunnen zenden?

5-Welke publieke informatie over de activiteiten is voorhanden? (Folders, websites, rapportages, et cetera.)

6-Zijn de activiteiten geëvalueerd of zijn er andere gegevens beschikbaar over de effecten van de activiteiten?

7-In hoeverre zijn andere (niet-gemeentelijke) organisaties betrokken bij de activiteiten? (Denk aan migrantenorganisaties, lokale media, PR adviseurs en communicatiebureaus, het bedrijfsleven, kerken et cetera.)

8-Zijn er in uw gemeente spanningen of incidenten (geweest) die de houding ten aanzien van immigranten negatief hebben beïnvloed? (Zo ja, graag kort toelichten.)

9-(Indien van toepassing, zie vraag 8:) In hoeverre zijn de communicatieactiviteiten in uw gemeente beïnvloed door deze gebeurtenissen en, omgekeerd, zijn eventuele spanningen door het communicatiebeleid van de gemeente afgenomen?

10-Naam gemeente:

11-Zouden we contact met u of een ander contactpersoon op mogen nemen voor eventuele aanvullende informatie? (Zo ja, graag gegevens vermelden.)

## References

CBS (Statistics Netherlands) (2008) Jaarrapport Integratie 2008. Den Haag/Heerlen: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

City of Arnhem (2011) *Integratie door participatie. Visienota integratiebeleid Gemeente Arnhem 2011-2015*. Gemeente Arnhem.

City of Delft (2007) *Perspectief voor alle Delftenaren. Integratienota 2008-2011*. Gemeente Delft.

City of Delft (2012) 'Delft, integration, civil society and attitudes to migrants'. Presentation local government of Delft by Deputy Mayor Saskia Bolten. AMICALL National Roundtable Conference The Netherlands. Erasmus University Rotterdam, 30th January 2012.

City of Enschede (2008) *Integratie en burgerschap 2008. Visie op een multicultureel Enschede*. Gemeente Enschede.

City of Leeuwarden (2008) *"Buiten de lijntjes kleuren". Herijking visie op integratie van de gemeente Leeuwarden*. Gemeente Leeuwarden.

City of Utrecht (2010) *Monitor Diversiteit en Integratie 2010*. Gemeente Utrecht.

College van B&W Rotterdam (2011) *Integratiedebatten: Mee(R) doen. Rotterdammers in actie*. Brief 11JOS06886. 19-04-2011. Gemeente Rotterdam

De Gruijter, M., E. Smits van Waesberghe & H. Boutellier (2010) *Een vreemde in eigen land. Boze autochtone burgers over nieuwe Nederlanders en de overheid*. Amsterdam: Aksant.

Entzinger, Han (2006) 'Changing the Rules While the Game Is On; From Multiculturalism to Assimilation in the Netherlands'; in: Y. Michal Bodemann & Gökçe Yurdakul, eds., *Migration, Citizenship, Ethnos*; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 121-144.

Entzinger, Han (2010) "Immigration: open borders, closing minds"; in E. Besamusca & J. Verheul (eds.) *Discovering the Dutch. On Culture and Society of the Netherlands*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 231-241.

Gidley, Ben (2011) *Attitudes to Migrants, Communication and Local Leadership: a background paper*. Oxford: COMPAS.

JOS (2010) *Allemaal Rotterdammers! Eindrapportage dialoog over stadsburgerschap 2007-2009*. Gemeente Rotterdam.

Poppelaars, C. & Scholten, P. 2008, 'Two Worlds Apart. The Divergence of National and Local Immigrant Integration Policies in the Netherlands', *Administration & Society* 40(4) pp. 335-357.

RMO (Raad voor de Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling) (2012) *Tussen afkomst en toekomst. Etnische categorisering door de overheid*; Den Haag: RMO

Scholten, Peter (2011) "Constructing Dutch Immigrant Policy: Research–Policy Relations and Immigrant Integration Policy-Making in the Netherlands", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol. 13, pp. 75-92.

SCP (2009) *Jaarrapport Integratie 2009*; Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

SCP (2011) *Wonen, wijken en interventies. Krachtwijkenbeleid in perspectief*; Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

SCP (2012) *Jaarrapport Integratie 2011*; Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Uitermark, Justus (2010) *Dynamics of Power in Dutch Integration Policies*; Amsterdam; diss. University of Amsterdam.

Van Straalen, Erik & Liem, Mei Ling 2009. *Procesevaluatie Wij Amsterdammers / Platform Amsterdam Samen. In opdracht van Burgemeester Job Cohen*. Bestuursdienst Amsterdam. Directie Stedelijke Bestuursadvisering. Gemeente Amsterdam.