

The integration of residents with non-western immigrant background Living in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht

10-8-2017

Name: Layla Farah
Anr: 209380

Supervisor: F.A. Heine

Abstract

The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in the Netherlands has been a topic of discussion for a while now. This discussion is often surrounded by much criticism and negativity since the integration has been labeled by many scholars and politicians as failed. In the past, this caused for a new approach to the integration policy that should have contributed to more integration. However, even with this new approach, integration is still seen as failing (Demant, 2005; Ham & van der Meer, 2012). Therefore, this study has focused on this particular subject.

Within this study, researched is how the integration has proceeded over the years for the biggest municipalities in the Netherlands, since they house most of the population with a non-western immigrant background (CBS, 2016). This has been done by looking at various aspects of integration, especially social-economic factors that affect the integration and the ethnic concentration level. This last aspect causes for spatial segregation which negatively affects the integration of mainly residents with a non-western immigrant background (Gijsberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010).

What becomes apparent out of this study is that residents with a non-western immigrant background in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht are not all progressing in regards to the integration. Only residents with a non-western immigrant background in Amsterdam are showing an improvement on all aspects of integration over the years. Residents with this particular background in the other three municipalities are showing less of a progress or even no progress at all in regards to the aspects affecting the integration (CBS, 2016; CBS, 2017; CBS, 2017; CBS, 2017; Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012).

Inhoud

Abstract	2
1. Problem analysis.....	4
1.1 Main question.....	5
1.2 Relevance	6
1.2.1 Societal relevance.....	6
1.2.2 Scientific relevance.....	6
2. Theoretical discussion	7
2.1 Discussion of relevant theory.....	7
2.1.1 The integration of immigrants in the Netherlands.....	7
2.1.2 Expectations arising from the literature	10
2.2 Discussion of relevant concept.....	10
2.2.1 Non western Immigrants.....	10
2.2.2 Integration	11
2.3 Conceptualization.....	12
3. Methodological framework.....	15
3.1 Research strategy	15
3.2 Methodology	15
3.3 Target population	15
3.4 Validity and reliability	15
4. Results	16
4.1 The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in the past (2008-2010) and present (2014-2016).....	16
4.1.1 Amsterdam	16
4.1.2 Rotterdam	20
4.1.3 The Hague.....	25
4.1.4 Utrecht.....	29
4.2 What differences are to be noted between the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in these four municipalities	32
4.3 Expectations from the literature in line with the results from this study?	34
Conclusion	36
References.....	38

1. Problem analysis

The end of 2010 is seen as the beginning of the Arab spring. The Arab spring refers to a wave of uprisings in countries such as Tunisia, Egypt and Libya. These uprisings had major consequences for countries in Europe and even resulted in a crisis for many European leaders. This crisis revolved around the large flow of immigrants towards Europe. Most of these immigrants were fleeing the wars that started as a result of the uprisings. Italy and Greece were often used as entry points to access Europe and afterwards they traveled on to other countries in Europe (Park, 2015). These countries already were dealing with integration issues of their residents with an immigrant background. According to Ederveen, et al. (2004), especially countries with a generous welfare provision have problems regarding integration such as high rates of unemployment and low education levels. The new influx of asylum seekers and the already existing problems revolving integration have put even more pressure on these particular member states of Europe. A striking consequence of this is the rise in popularity of far-right parties in these states. These parties are in general very negative towards immigrants and call for a more strict approach since they feel that this group of people are not integrating well into their society. This view has become much more supported by a large part of the European population. Even though, the new influx of immigrants caused for more popularity of this specific view towards immigrants, they did already exist for quite some time (Wansink, 2017). A good example of this is the Netherlands. In the past, the Netherlands was seen by many other countries such as Germany as a country in which there was much tolerance towards immigrants and a successful integration of them in society. Reason for this perspective was the integration model of the Netherlands which had a different approach to immigrants than for instance Germany and France. Germany had an approach in which immigrants were still seen as mainly guest workers and France on the other hand focused more so on assimilation. These types of approaches are typically described as showing less acceptance of the diversity within society caused by immigrants. However, the integration model of the Netherlands became a topic of discussion in Europe after the murder on Theo van Gogh. Theo van Gogh was a Dutch filmmaker, murdered for his critical view on the Islam by a resident with Moroccan heritage (non-western immigrant background). Especially, in the Dutch society, there was a call for less tolerance and more criticism on the integration of especially non-western immigrants (Michalowski, 2005). The integration policy was too soft and needed to be more strict. However, there was also quite some scholars and others that felt that this approach was causing for immigrants to feel excluded. The integration policy that was in place already mainly focused on ethnic minorities. This approach was deemed counterproductive by various experts and scholars. This specific approach was highlighting the differences between citizens with an immigrant background and those without such background. The wording and tone of the policies was causing for groups to feel excluded (Ham & van der Meer, 2012; Slegers, 2007; Dagevos & Grundel, 2013). Therefore a policy was created by the government in which they stated that the focus from now on would be on mutual commitment and continuity and a development from specific to generic policy was made (Rijksoverheid, 2011). This means that the policy does not target specific groups but immigrants in general and using neutral terms in order to solve problems. In addition, the national policy was decentralized to municipalities allowing them to design their own policy. Some municipalities chose to have a strict integration policy while others

shied away from this approach (Ham & van der Meer, 2012). This can cause for differences in the actual integration of the residents within the municipalities.

Even though changes have been brought to the integration policies in the Netherlands, there is still much criticism on the policies and in addition the integration of non-western immigrants is seen as not proceeding well by different parties (CBS, 2014; Dagevos & Grundel, 2013). However, there is not a consensus on this view of a failing of integration of immigrants. For instance, the commission Blok¹ conducted a study and came to the conclusion that the integration has not failed (Tweede Kamer der Staten- Generaal, 2004). In addition, Snel (2003) also does not agree with the public view on the integration and states that there has been made some progress. Furthermore, according to Snel, the whole discussion can be considered as stigmatizing towards especially second generation non-western immigrants. Nevertheless, there are not many parties supporting this view and looking at the public debate, it seems as if the integration process is proceeding equally as bad as in the past and that no progress has been made. This is remarkable, especially since the specific approach of the immigration policy was seen as the reason of why integration was failing and therefore this was discontinued (Ham & van der Meer, 2012). So, the new generic approach should have accelerated the integration process. Therefore, I have decided to conduct a study on this topic and look into the integration of non-western immigrants in the Netherlands.

More specifically, this study is looking at the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. Reason for this is that most of the population with a non-western immigrant background in the Netherlands live in the bigger cities such as Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. These four cities are located within the Randstad, and are also called the G4 cities. In addition, this area contains almost the same amount of residents with an immigrant background as residents without one (CBS, 2016; CBS, n.d.). This represents a larger sample resulting in more valid outcomes. So this study focuses on this topic and looks into the integration of non-western immigrants in these four municipalities. These municipalities are also compared to one another since the national policy on integration has been decentralized allowing municipalities to create their own policy which may cause for differences in the actual integration. Furthermore, in general the municipalities differ from each other looking for instance at their economic positions (Ham & van der Meer, 2012; Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012).

1.1 Main question

So in this study, the focus is on the integration of non-western immigrants in the four biggest municipalities in the Netherlands which are Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. To see if any progress has been made, the past and present of the integration within these municipalities is researched. Furthermore by looking at these four municipalities, the differences in integration between the cities will become clear. Therefore the main question of this study is as follows:

In comparison, how has the integration of residents with a non-western background living in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, The Hague and Utrecht developed over the years?

¹ A temporary research committee into the integration policy, set by the government, chaired by the MP Block

This main question is answered on the basis of the sections as described below. In the first section, the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in the past and present is described. This is done for all four of the municipalities. The past stands for the period between 2008 and 2010. The current situation (present) stands for the time period of 2014 up to 2016. Why these periods of time have been chosen, will be addressed later on in this study. Furthermore, the development of the integration process of residents in the different municipalities over the years will also be compared in which differences may become apparent. The possible underlying causes for these differences are therefore also examined within this study.

1. The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in the past (2008-2010) and present (2014-2016).
 - The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in Amsterdam.
 - The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in Rotterdam.
 - The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in The Hague.
 - The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in Utrecht
2. The differences in the integration process between residents with a non- western immigrant background in the four municipalities (over the years).

1.2 Relevance

1.2.1 Societal relevance

The integration of immigrants has been a topic of debate in society and also through politics since the seventies in the Netherlands. The discussion has mainly been centering around the criticism on residents with a non-western immigrants and their lack of integration into Dutch society (Ham & van der Meer, 2012). The latest influx of refugees has made this debate about the integration even more relevant (Mattheijer, 2000). In 2015, there were approximately 60.000 asylum requests which is almost twice as much as the year before. Most of the persons requesting asylum are from non-western countries such as Syria (Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland, n.d.). A great deal of these people become citizens of the Netherlands and are expected by the public and the government to integrate into society (Rijksoverheid, n.d.). However, the fear exists that since the integration of the group of immigrants is supposedly failing, the same will happen with new immigrants. The government describes the integration as failing when people are living alongside each other and immigrants insufficiently integrate into society (Rijksoverheid, 2011). Within this study, it is examined how the integration has been proceeding. This will partly indicate whether the fear and criticism is well founded. Therefore, by analyzing the integration over the years, a contribution is made to the societal debate.

1.2.2 Scientific relevance

The integration in the past was labeled as failed and it still is by many people such as scholars, experts and politicians. It seems as if the integration has been the same as in the past and that residents with a non-western immigrants have not made any progress over the years in the Netherlands. This while the new approach to the integration policies should have contributed to the integration process as the old specific approach was seen as problematic (Ham & van der Meer, 2012; CBS, 2014). So, the new generic approach should have accelerated the integration process.

Therefore, a study on this topic and look into the integration of immigrants is done for the cities Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague and Utrecht. These municipalities have been chosen because most of the population with a non-western immigrant background live in the biggest municipalities which are these four municipalities (CBS, 2016). Therefore, these municipalities are being analyzed. Furthermore, it is checked whether there are differences between these four places in the Netherlands. If so, what are these differences? If certain municipalities show more progress, lessons can then be drawn from this to further improve integration in municipalities that are not showing as much progress. So, within this study, these questions are answered. By researching this specific case and looking at various aspects of integration, a contribution is made to the scientific literature on this topic.

2. Theoretical discussion

2.1 Discussion of relevant theory

In the past sections, the debate around integration has already been cited to some extent. Within this section, a further examination of this is done by more specifically looking at the scientific discussion around the assumed failing integration. The integration policy is often seen as a cause of this, because it is expected to contribute to the integration. Therefore a start is made by further explaining the views surrounding this. Additionally, provided are also other perspectives on the integration from different scholars on this topic.

2.1.1 The integration of immigrants in the Netherlands

The integration of immigrants into the Dutch society is affected by various aspects. One of these aspects which is often cited in the scientific debate around integration is the integration policy. The Netherlands has an integration policy for immigrants in which the emphasis lies on the participation of individual immigrants. The national government (Rijksoverheid, n.d.), describes the integration policy of the country as strict but fair. If one receives a residents permit, integration into Dutch society is expected. In the first place, this consists of speaking the language and having knowledge on Dutch society, which gets tested by an integration test and is necessary for the naturalization (Rijksoverheid, n.d.). However, the integration policy, aimed at the integration of migrants, receives much criticism. Mattheijer (2000) and Slegers (2007), feel that the policy is inefficient and counter-productive. The policy has been more focused on non-western culture and Islam as factors that hinder the integration process instead of the focus before being on social-economic factors. Differences between foreigners and non-foreigners are emphasized within the policy. The policy is too much focused on assimilation and uses particular words that are doing the opposite of what the policy should be doing which is ensuring integration of immigrants (Slegers, 2007). de Bruijn (2011) showed in his book how language can contain a normative judgment. This causes for certain words to be associated with negative thoughts while others with a similar meaning are associated with positive feelings. So the language that is used in for instance policies, expresses and creates reality. This is also the case for the word foreigner that was often used in former integration policies. According to Verhaeghe (2010), the phrase 'foreigner' can be considered as negative because of the word showing the radical other of the non-foreigner which is perceived as the good one. In addition,

the word also is often associated with retardation. Therefore, you could say that making a distinction between foreigner and non-foreigner in policy and more generally in the public debate causes for the group with a non-western background to feel like they are different, lesser and excluded. However there are scholars that do not agree with this view. One of them is Pinto (2004) who on the contrary finds that the integration policy is too soft and is lacking obligation. Pinto calls for a more tougher approach in the policy. However, there is not much support for this view. This can also be noticed out of the change in approach taken in the national policy. In 2011, the government has chosen to have a more generic approach when it comes to the integration policy. The integration policy of the past which focused on specific ethnic groups has been discontinued. Furthermore, this policy field has been decentralized for a large part to municipalities. Municipalities do not necessarily have to take the same approach taken by the national government (Ham & van der Meer, 2012; Rijksoverheid, 2011).

Besides the type of integration policy, Scheffer (2000) states that the difference in culture also causes for issues surrounding integration. Especially, culture in addition with Islamic beliefs clashes with the Dutch society. Furthermore, he also feels that Dutch people have a boundless and open attitude while non-western Muslim immigrants are very closed off. Therefore, this group opposes a threat to the Dutch society. This view of Scheffer is one often shared by the right side of the political spectrum in the Netherlands. For instance, the view of one of the biggest parties in the Netherlands (amount of seats), the PVV, is that Islamic beliefs clash with Dutch values and norms (Niemoller, n.d.) Schinkel (2008) agrees to some extent with this view of Scheffer. He agrees with culture differences causing issues in regards to integration. However, he is not as critical on the non-western Muslim immigrants as Scheffer is. Schinkel describes in his book that the immigrant can never become part of the Dutch society in the eyes of the so-called unity. This is because of them having a different culture. This culture is seen as a problem. Dutch culture is the dominant culture that is seen as the right one and all kinds of other cultures are considered as less. Schinkel therefore finds that culture is problematic (Schinkel, 2008, p. 81). A current research regarding the integration of students also shows that cultural differences are causing issues. More than half of the teachers and school leaders in the 4 major cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam The Hague and Utrecht), agree with the view that integration has failed. Approximately 60% of the respondents (Teachers and school leaders) state that the integration is failing because of the differences in values between citizens with a western and non-western background. Often, non-western immigrants mainly deal with each other and hold on to their own culture. This causes for children to adapt only at school to the values and norms but at home they often live in their parents' culture according to the respondents (DUO Onderwijsonderzoek, 2017). The culture differences will grow as there is more segregation. Segregation is often described in society as the separation of certain population groups. These population groups may consist of people with a particular ethnic background or people with the same social-economic status (DWARS onderwijscommissie, 2011). Segregation mainly happens in the bigger cities and the more urban areas of a country. The cause of especially spatial segregation in these municipalities is due to the residents with a non-western immigrant background having low-incomes. By having a low-income, they are often only able to get social housing. These social houses are usually concentrated in the same neighborhood and that results into more segregation. The affect that this has is that there is less interethnic contact (Nieuwenhuizen, 2005). There being less interethnic contact affects mainly the social-cultural integration. More interethnic contact between

different groups causes for less fear towards immigrants and a better understanding. This than results in less discrimination and feelings of exclusion. Discrimination and exclusion can cause for less opportunities and less motivation to be an active participant in society. Another reason for interethnic contact being important comes from a network approach. For example, when finding a job, contact with people from other groups is important. Especially networking with the persons of the dominant culture will contribute to more possibilities since they usually have the recourses (Abdou & Gilbert, 2009; Gijssberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010). Therefore, segregation has a negative effect on the integration of residents with an immigrant background.

Lastly, integration is also affected by the economic structure of a particular area. Certain places for instance have high unemployment rates and few job opportunities. In the Netherlands, high unemployment rates in particular cities are blamed on the amount of immigrants. However, these cities also show that residents without an immigrant background are not doing that great. Scholars such as Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, (2012) account this to the economic structure of the cities. Economies that are based on trading, financial services and commercial services are doing better than those depending on the industry. This is due to globalization and the technical evolution which also is causing there to be less demand for this type of industrial work. In the past, many non-western immigrants came to the Netherlands to do this type of work. So since this type of work is becoming less, it therefore also heavily affects them and especially the first generation of non-western immigrants. The first generation of immigrants have more of a backlog in regards to the language and little education. Therefore, less industrial work means for them also less participation on the labor market which is an important part of integration. However, for second generation immigrant other rules apply. They have had more education and speak the language better. So they should not necessarily be bound to this type of work. However, areas in which the economy mostly revolves around the industry sector, provides little opportunities. Furthermore, the economic structure of a particular city also affects the type of companies that will settle. The economic structures consisting of trading, financial services and commercial services will attract more companies and entrepreneurs. More companies and entrepreneurs will result in more labor market opportunities, also for residents with a non-western immigrant background (Planbureau voor Leefomgeving, 2016; Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012)

As can be noted, there are different perspectives on the integration of immigrants. Certain scholars view the integration as failing due to the integration policy. Others blame the non-western immigrant group, more specifically their culture and religion as the cause. There are not many scholars who do not agree with either of these views. So, looking at the debate as described within this section, an expected outcome of this study is that the integration is failing and no progress has been made. However, all of these studies have in common that most of the focus is on the underlying reason for why the integration has been failing and provides little data on the actual integration progress. This makes the discussion around this topic seem more subjective. Therefore, within this study, data will be presented of the actual integration process over the and conclusions are drawn from this.

2.1.2 Expectations arising from the literature

The scientific literature provides a perspective on integration supported by various scholars in which the integration policies is to blame for the integration issues. Reason for this is because of it focusing on specific ethnic groups and being too strict. Another perspective within the literature is that culture is to blame for the failing integration. Culture differences are amplified by segregation. Segregation causes for less interethnic contacts. This while interethnic contacts contribute to the integration, so more segregation is not wanted. Lastly, the economic structure is noted as another important aspect affecting integration. Cities with economies that are mainly based on the industrial sector are doing bad due to the technical revolution. Less companies and entrepreneurs will settle there which will cause for less job opportunities and more unemployment (Sleegers, 2007; Ham & van der Meer, 2012; Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012; Scheffer, 2000; Gijsberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010). From this, certain expectations emerge for this study.

The first expectation that comes forward out of the literature and debate around this whole topic is that the integration process of residents with a non-western immigrant background has not improved over the years. There are several causes provided by scholars for why this has not been proceeding well.

There are also expectations regarding the comparison between the municipalities. First of all, non-western immigrants in municipalities with a specific and strict approach towards integration will have less of a positive development of integration over the years than those that do not have such an approach. Second of all, municipalities in which there is relatively more segregation of groups will show less integration progress in time. Lastly, municipalities with economic structures revolving around the industrial sector will also show less positive development in regards to the integration of non-western immigrants.

By looking at the development of the integration process over the years within and between residents of the municipalities, it is also examined whether these expectation stemming from the literature are correct.

2.2 Discussion of relevant concept

The concepts that come forward out of the main question and the theoretical discussion will be described in this chapter.

2.2.1 Non- western immigrants

The residents with an immigrant background can be divided into two groups. The first group are residents with a western immigrant background. This group is not as large as the group of residents with a non-western immigrant background. This division between these two groups is determined by the origin of the immigrant. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics, non-western immigrants are those from countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia (excluding Indonesia and Japan) or Turkey (CBS, n.d.). The residents with a non-western immigrant background are further separated in first generation, second generation, etc. The first generation is that of the birthplace of the person at hand. The second generation are the children of the first generation in which the mothers native country decides the origin of the child. However, if the mother is born in the Netherlands, the

father's birthplace will determine the origin of the child (Booi, Laan, Lindeman, & Slot, 2011).

In 2016 there were approximately 2.1 million persons with a non-western immigrant background in the Netherlands. Two third of this group of residents with a non-western immigrant background belong to the four traditional immigrant groups that had settled in the Netherlands in the 1960s. The largest group is from Turkish origin, with approximately 400.000 people. The second largest group are those with a Moroccan background (390.000 people). This is closely followed by citizens with a Surinamese and Antillean background. Often, the other citizens (from non-western countries) without one of these four backgrounds are referred to as: other non-western immigrants (CBS, 2016; Nicolaas, Wobma, & Ooijevaar, 2010).

2.2.2 Integration

Integration refers to a process of increasing participation and position attainment in society, with the goal of full participation in that society (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2012). Integration can be described from different angles such as from a structural, social and cultural dimension. Structural integration mainly revolves around socio-economic factors such as income, labor market participation and education. Especially, these indicators, income, labor market participation and education are seen as a precondition for the structural integration of a person (Dagevos, 2001).

The social and cultural integration are much more difficult to describe which can be seen throughout the various descriptions of scholars. The scholars do not share a common definition of what social-cultural integration is. They use different definition when describing this concept. Nevertheless, there are similarities within the descriptions in regards to the social-cultural integration. They all refer to: the level of informal social contacts with the indigenous people and the distinctive character of the culture of the immigrant groups. However, both these aspects can be considered as fairly subjective (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2005). Especially, the cultural integration element is fairly subjective. This element refers to the extent in which norms, values and attitudes of the native people are taken over by immigrants. However, it is difficult to compare values, norms and attitudes of ethnic minorities and immigrants because of it being located in the cultural heterogeneity of both the native and immigrant group. So the problem is that these values, norms and standards show a large variation, even within the indigenous population. Therefore, the focus for this study is more on the social integration aspects which is reflected by the contact between the native group and immigrant. To measure this aspect, the emphasis will be on what causes for more or less integration, which is ethnic concentration. For instance, the contact between indigenous group and immigrant is affected for a great deal by ethnic concentration in neighborhoods. This causes for groups to be separated and not being able to easily come in contact with each other. Therefore this aspect is also included, as well as aspects of structural integration (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2005). In the next section, conceptualization, this is further addressed.

2.3 Conceptualization

This chapter is devoted to a further explanation of the concept integration. Before anything can be said about the extent of the integration of non-western immigrants living in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, The Hague and Utrecht, it is important to know how integration can be recognized and measured. As stated before, the focus is mainly on socio-economic factors which are part of the structural integration. However, added is the ethnic concentration in neighborhoods. This aspect is part of the social dimension of integration. Other aspects are not included for reasons as them not being objective enough but also because of there not being data available on these aspects for each of the municipalities. Indicators such as Language, among others, are therefore not included. There is little or no data available explaining the language backlog, etc. Often it is only mentioned that immigrants have a language backlog, but no data on this has been exempted. The inburgeringstoets which is an exam in which language is tested and is necessary to obtain the Dutch nationality could be a way to measure language. However, this would not portray results that could be seen as a fair reflection of reality. Citizens with a Turkish background are exempt from this test and they are the largest group within the non-western immigrant category. Therefore, for now, in table 1, a framework is designed including social-economic factors of structural integration, which are: average personal income, labor participation and education level. In addition, the main factor affecting social integration which is the level of ethnic concentration in neighborhoods is also included within the framework. Lastly, the two schemes, structural and social integration, are also forming the base for the comparison. All four cities are measured in the same way with these criteria's (Europa Nu, 2011; Dagevos, 2001; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2005). After the framework, each of the factors of integration are also described separately for more clarity on what they exactly mean within this context.

Integration framework

Integration		Amsterdam	Rotterdam	Den Haag	Utrecht
Average personal income					
Labor market participation					
Secondary Education level:	Practical/vocational training				
	Preparatory secondary vocational education (vmbo)				
	Senior general secondary education (havo)				
	Pre-university education				
Post secondary education level:	Vocational education				
	Higher education (hbo)				
	Academic education (wo)				
Ethnic concentration level					

Table 1

Explanation of the framework

The first aspect of the framework is personal average income. This consists of the income collected out of labor and derived from own company. Furthermore, it also includes payment of income insurance and social security benefits. The income stands for the average amount that is collected out of these areas by a person on an annual basis (CBS, n.d.).

The second aspect of the framework is labor market participation. This consists of the people living in the Netherlands that are participating on the labor market, between the age of 15 to 75 years (CBS, n.d.)

The final aspect of structural integration within the framework is education. For this study, the focus is on secondary education and post secondary education. Secondary education consists of four main levels in which one is considered of a higher level or even better than the other. The first level of secondary education is practical/vocational training. A level higher is preparatory secondary vocational education (vmbo). This is followed by senior general secondary education (havo) and pre-university education (vwo) which is considered as the highest level of secondary education. Secondary education prepares students for either vocational education (mbo), higher education (hbo) or academic education (wo). These are the forms of education in which the focus lies within this study (Rijksoverheid, n.d.)

Social integration is described in this study by looking at the ethnic concentration in neighborhoods. More specifically, the amount of neighborhoods in a municipality with an overrepresentation of residents with a non-western immigrant background is analyzed. After this, the neighborhoods with an overrepresentation will be divided by the amount of neighborhoods in total within a municipality. The percentage that comes forward out of this will showcase the level of ethnic concentrated neighborhoods within a municipality (Dagevos & Gijsberts, 2007).

The aim of this study is to see how the integration has continued over the years. This done by describing integration in the past and present for each municipality. More specifically, data is provided of the aspects as describe above for the past and present time. Out of this, either progress, a decline or no change at all in a particular aspect of integration becomes apparent over the years. This will be diverted into percentages and is put into the framework (table 1). For instance, labor market participation of residents with a non-western immigrant background in Amsterdam show a progress between 2010 and 2016 of 3%. Rotterdam on the contrary only has 1% of a progress over the years which is less than for Amsterdam. Than it can be said that residents in Amsterdam show more progress than Rotterdam on this aspect of integration. These percentages are then put into table 1. Furthermore it is also possible that there is a decline to be noticed in one of the aspects of integration over the years. Therefore, in front of all percentages, a plus or minus will be attached. To be clear, a minus does not have to be bad. For certain aspects, a minus and thus a decline of that aspect over the years is considered good. The aspects for which this applies are: practical/vocational training, preparatory vocationally education, vocational education and the ethnic concentration level. For these aspects, a minus translates into a positive outcome of integration.

3. Methodological framework

3.1 Research strategy

The main question focuses on the integration level of resident with a non-western immigrant background living in the municipalities Rotterdam, Amsterdam, the Hague and Utrecht. A suitable strategy resulting from this was doing a desk study and thus analyzing existing material (Thiel, 2010). The existing material mainly consists of data available on the different criteria's mentioned in the section, Conceptualization. For instance, data available on unemployment rate of immigrants has been used. By doing this, the integration level could be measured for both time periods of this particular group of residents in the four municipalities.

3.2 Methodology

To answer the main question of this study, a method called secondary analysis is used. Secondary analysis means that existing data is being transformed and used in a different way. This is also the case for this study. There was already data available on the different aspects of integration. However, not all of this data could be used in the way it has been presented. Therefore, it had to be transformed in a way that would be useful for this study. For instance, the data available on education had to be transformed into for instance percentages but also had to be divided into separate parts. Another example is the data on neighborhoods. There was data available on neighborhoods and also on the amount of residents with a non-western immigrant background. However, the data needed to be merged so that the level of ethnic concentrated neighborhoods in a municipality became clear. Therefore, data was available for the aspects of integration but had to be transformed and recalculated so that it would be of use for this study (Thiel, 2010).

3.3 Target population

In this study data has been collected on the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background. There are approximately 2.1 million people living in the Netherlands with a non-western immigrant background. Most of the people with this immigrant background are residents in the major cities. The major cities in the Netherlands are Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht (CBS, 2016). Therefore, the focus of this study will be on residents with a non-western immigrant background living in these four major cities.

3.4 Validity and reliability

Validity and reliability of a study are essential. Measures used need to be valid and in addition, the measure needs to consistently provide the results over repeated tests. In this study, measures are taken to ensure the validity and reliability. For instance, the concept integration contains different elements. Various studies name the elements used in this study as a precondition of integration. Thus, not only one study was used but numerous so that validity was guaranteed. The reliability of the study and more specifically the consistency will be ensured. This has been done by using the same technique in collecting data for the past and present sections. By being consistent in the way that data is collected, results that come forward are reliable (Hu & Olshfski, 2007).

4. Results

4.1 The integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in the past (2008-2010) and present (2014-2016).

In this section, the integration of residents with a non-western immigrants background is described for the time periods of 2008-2010 and 2014-2016. In 2011, the national government decided to discontinue the integration policy focused on specific groups (Ham & van der Meer, 2012; Rijksoverheid, 2011). This approach of focusing on specific groups was seen by many scholars, experts and politicians as ineffective. As a result, various municipalities also decided to put an end to this specific approach and many even stopped having an integration policy at all (Slegers, 2007; Ham & van der Meer, 2012). To see if the integration has made progress since the ending of this approach, it is of importance to describe the integration in the past (<2011). The reason why a time period of two years has been chosen is because the current situation that is also discussed within this section is only for two years. The current situation includes the year 2014 up to 2016. In 2014, council elections were held which also resulted in new policies. Therefore the period from 2014 and onwards will be described here. The current situation described here is up to 2016 since most of the current data available is only up to this year. Thus, in this section, first the integration policies are shortly described, since this is the reason why these particular periods have been chosen. Then data is presented on the integration with the help of the framework presented in the section 2.3 for Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. Furthermore, a comparison has been made between residents of the four municipalities with a non-western immigrant background.

4.1.1 Amsterdam

Amsterdam is the capital of the Netherlands and has the most inhabitants within the country (CBS, 2017). Often places like Amsterdam, which are considered urban areas, are seen as multicultural places with all sorts of diverse people (Ray, 2003). The municipality Amsterdam states that their population is becoming more diverse, partially caused by the residents with a non-western immigrant background growing. Within this group, there is also an increase to be seen in heterogeneity. Therefore, the municipality can be considered as a 'super diverse' place since there is not an apparent group that is the dominant nor majority one (Gemeente Amsterdam, n.d.). The diversity is also reflected within the past integration policy, referred to as a diversity and integration policy. In theory, the municipality did not see this policy as exclusively designed for specific groups. However, it was stated by the municipality that the policy is generic in terms of formulation but can be made specific for certain groups. This can also for instance be noted out of a program that was aimed at the youth with an Antillean and Moroccan background, which was considered a risk group. This shows that the municipality had a specific approach at times for integration (Booi, Laan, Lindeman, & Slot, 2011; de Boom, van Wensveen, Weltevrede, Hermus, Seidler, & van San, 2011). However, Amsterdam has stopped with this specific approach and currently it does not have an integration policy anymore but a diversity policy. The municipality stated that integration is for all citizens and not for a particular group (Asscher, 2014).

In first instance, integration policies were mainly created for the large amount of immigrants becoming regular Dutch citizens. Especially, larger cities have always had a great amount of residents

with an immigrant background. This has also been the case for the municipality Amsterdam. In 2010, Amsterdam had 268.211 residents with a non-western immigrant background which makes for 34% of the citizens being of non-western heritage. This was almost the same amount of residents without an immigrant background, in general, in Amsterdam. Within this Group, citizens with a Surinamese and Moroccan background were the most represented. Since 2010, the amount of immigrants has risen in Amsterdam. This is partially caused by the second-generation immigrants and the latest influx of refugees. The first generation immigrants, in size, was decreasing while the second generation was growing, which was especially the case for the 'traditional' immigrant groups that came to the Netherlands in the 1960's. At the moment, the municipality has more citizens with an immigrant background than without one. However, relatively the same applies as for 2010. Approximately 35% of the citizens in Amsterdam have a non-western immigrant background (CBS, 2017; Booi, Laan, Lindeman, & Slot, 2011; Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012; Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland, n.d.). For both residents with a non-western immigrant background, the past and present integration is described on the basis of the framework (table 1).

The first aspect of the framework is average personal income (on annual basis). In 2010, Amsterdam had 599.800 residents with an income on an annual basis. On average, these residents had a personal income of 29.700 Euros. Residents with a non-western immigrant background, consisted of approximately 184.300 persons with an income. Of this group, the average personal income amounted to 21.300 Euros on an annual basis (CBS, 2016). Looking at this number, the group with a non-western immigrant background is part of the category 'lower incomes'. The municipality Amsterdam, categorizes incomes between 17.528 and 24.209 Euros as lower income, depending on either living alone or with others. This is similar to the description of the IRS (Gemeente Amsterdam, n.d.; Belastingdienst, n.d.). This has not changed much over the years and the average personal income of this group still is within the category of the lower incomes. On an average base, the residents with a non-western immigrant background currently have an average personal income of 22.500 Euros. Compared to the past, the average personal income has increased. However, the incomes of other residents without immigrant backgrounds or western immigrant background also increased (CBS, 2016).

The second aspect of the framework, closely related to income, is labor market participation. The personal income of a person consists for a big part out of income retrieved through participating on the labor market. Therefore, a person having a lower annual income could also mean that the participation on the labor market is lower (CBS, n.d.). This has also been the case when looking at the income and labor market participation of residents with a non-western immigrant background between 2008 and 2010. Within this period, about 56.8% of the non-western immigrant group was participating on the labor market. Their income and labor market participation was lower than that of residents without an immigrant background or a western immigrant background. However, over the years the labor market participation of these particular residents has risen, even more than for the other two groups. The participation grew with a percent more than for instance the group of residents without an immigrant background. For instance, in 2014, the participation was 57% and in 2016 this grew to 59%. Within this group, citizens with a Surinamese and Antillean background are doing better than those with a Turkish and Moroccan background. The sector in which the

participation is the highest for those with a non-western immigrant background is trade, health and welfare (CBS, 2017; Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012).

The third aspect of the framework is education. Education is often seen as an indicator for the possible success a person may have on the labor market. More education and a higher level of education will most likely enhance the opportunities on the labor market. So, residents with a non-western immigrant background have low labor market participation especially when compared to other residents. This then would also mean lower education levels which also clear out of data presented by the Central Bureau of Statistics. In general, students with a non-western immigrant background had relatively low education levels in the past. In the school year 2009/2010, 31.568 students attended secondary education in Amsterdam. From the 3th grade on, 9885 students with a non-western immigrant background attended secondary education. As been noted before, secondary education can be divided into four main levels in which one is considered a higher level of education than another. Students with a non-western background are mainly attending preparatory secondary vocational education, which is considered as one of the lowest level of education. More than half of the students with a non-western background attended this level of education. Only 18% of the students with this background attended the highest level of secondary education, which is pre-university education (18%). Over the years, this has changed and the education level of students in Amsterdam with a non-western immigrant background went up. For instance, in the school year 2015-2016, more students attended pre-university education (19%) and less were on the level of preparatory secondary vocational education (47%) (CBS, 2017; Traag, van der Valk, van der Velden, de Vries, & Wolbers, 2004).

After secondary education, students may choose to continue or discontinue their education. In most cases, students choose to continue with their education. Reason for this is that it results in more job opportunities whilst not continuing makes for fewer opportunities. Therefore, only a small percentage drops out after secondary education. Those that carry on either attend vocational education, higher education or academic education. In the past, students with a non-western immigrant background mostly attended the lowest form of education between these three levels, which is the vocational education. For instance, only 17% of students with a non-western immigrant background attended academic education. However, this did change over the years. In the school year 2015/2016 approximately 20% attended the highest level of education. Also to be noted is that 7% less students with a non-western immigrant background attended vocational education which is considered one of the lowest forms of post-secondary education (CBS, 2017; De Witte, Cabus, Groot, & van den Brink, 2014).

The fourth aspect of the framework is ethnic concentration of immigrants. This revolves around the spatial concentration of immigrants in certain neighborhoods. The ethnic concentrated neighborhoods have a high concentration of immigrants and a low concentration of residents without an immigrant background (or vice versa). The consequence of this is that there will be less interethnic contact between these groups, which will affect the social integration of especially immigrants. Furthermore, concentration neighborhoods also causes for more tension between different groups within a society. Therefore, ethnic concentration is often seen as a negative factor of integration (Gijsberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010).

In 2010, Amsterdam had 111 neighborhoods with residents according to the Central Bureau of Statistics. There were 18 neighborhoods of the total with an overrepresentation of non-western immigrants. An overrepresentation means that more than 50% of the people living there are of non-western descent. There were even two neighborhoods, De Kolenkit and De Bijlmer, which encompassed 75 % of non-western immigrants. In total, the ethnic concentration level of the municipality Amsterdam amounted to 16.2 % of neighborhoods with an overrepresentation of non-western immigrants in 2010 (CBS, 2014; Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving, 2010). Over the years, the ethnic concentration level went down to 14%. For instance, in 2016, Amsterdam had 105 neighborhoods with residents of which 15 had an overrepresentation of residents with a non-western immigrant background. Compared to the past, there are not any neighborhoods left of which more than 75% of the residents have a non-western immigrant background (CBS, 2017).

Overview for Amsterdam

In table 2, an overview is given of all the data described above. The data is presented in three columns. One column represents data of a particular integration aspect in the past and the other column does this for the present time. There is also a third column which shows the change between the past and present in percentage. This column shows how a particular aspect of integration has either progressed, declined or not changed from the past to the present.

Furthermore, this column with data presenting the change between the past and present will also be used later when the four municipalities are being compared. For now, the data shown is only for the municipality of Amsterdam. This overview provides exact data of all of the aspects of integration. Furthermore, most of the data is transformed to percentages except for income. It was not possible to put the data of income, presented in the columns of the past and present, into percentages in a way that it would be clear of what the meaning of it would be. Therefore, income is in amount of Euros. For the other indicators, it was possible and also necessary to put in percentage so that a fair representation could be given and differences became apparent.

<i>Integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background.</i>		<i>Past</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>Average personal Income (on annual basis)</i>		21.400€	22.500€	+5%
<i>Labor market participation</i>		57%	59%	+2%
<i>Secondary education level</i>	Practical/vocational training	11%	10%	-1%
	Preparatory secondary vocational education (vmbo)	51%	47%	-4%
	Senior general secondary school (havo)	20%	24%	+4%
	Pre-university education (vwo),	18%	19%	+1%
<i>Post- secondary education level</i>	Vocational education (mbo)	52%	45%	-7%
	Higher education (hbo)	31%	35%	+4%
	Academic education (wo)	17%	20%	+3%
<i>Level of ethnic concentration</i>		16 %	14 %	-2%

Table 2

4.1.2 Rotterdam

In general, Rotterdam always had a history of being strict and to some degree also putting blame on residents with a non-western immigrant background for their lack of integration. This is the opposite of the approach taken by Amsterdam. The different perspective of Rotterdam can also be noted from its past integration policy, in which the focus for a great deal was on the ethnical background. This can for instance be seen in the Rotterdamwet, which was put in place in 2006. The act regarded particular neighborhoods in Rotterdam with already high levels of lower incomes and immigrants. By implementing this act, people with lower incomes are not allowed to live in these neighborhoods. Another example of the specific approach that Rotterdam had to integration was the Antillean/ Moroccan program for the youth (similar to Amsterdam). However, Rotterdam also stated that, in the future it would like to have less of such a specific approach. This by focusing more on

counteracting issues in general and less on the ethnical background of residents. The municipality made a start with this new approach by for instance facilitating less operational activities. However, the current integration policy still mainly focuses on the citizens with a non-western immigrant background. The current integration nota of Rotterdam for instance states that integration relates to efforts made by the immigrant to participate in society. An important part of this is properly speaking the Dutch language and respecting the Dutch norms and values. Even though the municipality stated that it was trying to move away from this specific approach in the past, it still focuses greatly on ethnicity. (Coello, Dagevos, Huinder, van der Leun, & Odé, 2013; Engbersen, 2014; Gemeente Rotterdam, 2015; Ham & van der Meer, 2012)

The integration policy is thus directed towards the residents with an (non-western) immigrant background. Rotterdam has the highest percentage of residents from non-western countries. More so, the amount of persons with such a background has risen over the years for Rotterdam. In 2010, 218.927 residents of Rotterdam had a non-western immigrant background. This has increased to 236.732 persons in 2016. The total population of Rotterdam consists of 629.606 residents of which almost half has an immigrant background. The non-western immigrant group makes up for almost 40% of this total. This is 6% higher than for Amsterdam (capital of the Netherlands) (CBS, 2017; Ham & van der Meer, 2012). For the population with a non-western immigrant background in Rotterdam, the integration is described by the aspects of integration provided in table 1.

Rotterdam has been labeled as the poorest area in the Netherlands (Goderik & Vrooman, 2016). This is also reflected in the average personal income of residents in Rotterdam (on annual basis), which has been low for more than a decade now. In 2010, the average personal income in Rotterdam was 26.500 Euros. However, this is much lower compared to other municipalities in the Netherlands. Reason given for this low average income and the label of the poorest area, is the amount of people in Rotterdam with a non-western immigrant background. Residents with this particular background earned an average personal income of 20.100 Euros (CBS, 2016). In general, incomes in the Netherlands that are below approximately 22.000 Euros are categorized as lower incomes. This often means that a person earning underneath this amount annually, is entitled to all kinds of surcharges and pays less taxes (Belastingdienst, n.d.). Over the years, this did not change much. The personal income in Rotterdam is still very low with its citizens, averagely, earning 27.800 Euros. This is for instance 4.000 Euros lower than the average income of Amsterdammers in 2014. In addition, the average income of residents with a non-western immigrant background has not changed much either and they have a personal income of 21.000 Euros. This amount is much lower than that of the residents with a western immigrant background or those without an immigrant background (CBS, 2016).

Rotterdam being labeled as the poorest area, also translates to the amount of persons living on benefits and not participating in the labor market. The municipality scores above average on this aspect as well, compared too many other areas in the Netherlands. This has been the case in the past and currently still is. For instance, in 2010, the average labor market participation of the municipality was 63% which was 6% lower than in Amsterdam. Also over the years the labor market participation went down and in 2016 it was 57%. The residents with a non-western immigrant background participate less than this average on the labor market. Their labor market participation currently is

around 52%. This is higher than in the past, for which the labor market participation was 51%. However, this is still significantly lower than the participation of non-western immigrants in Amsterdam which is close to 60% (Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012; Goderik & Vrooman, 2016; CBS, 2017).

The third aspect of the framework is education. As been stated before, aspects such as income and labor market participation are for a great deal affected by the type of education a person has had. Rotterdam is an area with a high percentage of low educated persons in general. This while urban cities are suppose to contain higher educated people than less urbanized areas. Rotterdam is therefore seen as an exception to the rule. In the period 2008-2010, approximately a third of less educated people lived in the area of Rijnmond which covers Rotterdam and the surrounding area (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2011). One of the causes of the lower education level is linked to the amount of non-western immigrants. Rotterdam has a high amount of residents with a non-western immigrant background and this group often has a lower level of education than those without such background (Gemeente Rotterdam, n.d.). Looking at data presented by the Central Bureau of Statistics, this is in line with the view presented above. Rotterdam had 28.730 students in 2009/2010 that attended secondary education, dived into 15.600 being of non-western origin, 2.202 students with a western immigrant background and lastly 10.829 with no immigrant background at all. There were thus more students of non-western origin than without any immigrant background attending secondary school In 2009/2010. Within this study, data from the 3th grade and onwards is analyzed since the previous year usually consists of levels that are combined. The levels of education from year 3 and onwards consist, as is stated before, out of the four levels which can be ranked from low to high. Most of the students with a non-western immigrant background attended one of the lowest levels of secondary education which is preparatory secondary vocational education (52%). All the other students either attended senior general secondary school (20%) or pre-university education (15%). There is also a small amount that attended practical/vocational training, namely 13%. For the students without an immigrant background or a western immigrant background, the data shows more of an equal balance between the levels with the exception of practical/vocational training (CBS, 2017). Currently, the education level for the students of non-western origin is even lower than it was before. For instance, in the school year 2015/2016, 53% of the students with a non-western immigrant background attended preparatory secondary vocation education and less attended pre-university education. This shows a decline in secondary education level of students with this particular background (CBS, 2016) (CBS, 2017).

When it comes to the post secondary education, there is a positive change to be noticed for students with a non-western immigrant background. In the past they were highly represented in the vocational education which is one of the lowest post-secondary education levels. However, there is a decline to be noted in the amount of students with this particular background that is attending this level of education. In the past, 55% of all students with this background attending post-secondary education attended this level. Currently this has went down to 53% and also more students are in higher education. Nevertheless, there is no increase to be noted over the years of these students attending academic education. For exact percentages of all of these groups, an overview is added at the end (CBS, 2017).

The fourth aspect, categorized under social integration in the framework, is ethnic concentration of immigrants. Over the years, the ethnic concentration of immigrants in Rotterdam went down. However, compared to other municipalities, it is still relatively high. This is especially striking, since the municipality put an act in place (in 2006) called the Rotterdamwet, which was supposed to counteract this. For instance, in 2010, Rotterdam had 102 neighborhoods with residents according to the CBS (2014). Of these 102 neighborhoods, there were 18 with an overrepresentation of residents with a non-western immigrant background. These 18 neighborhoods equate with more than 50% of residents being of non-western origin. Afrikaanderwijk and Feijenoord are even two neighborhoods that encompassed 75 % of non-western immigrants or more. In total, the ethnic concentration of Rotterdam amounts to approximately 18 % of neighborhoods with an overrepresentation of residents with non-western heritage (CBS, 2014; Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving, 2010). Currently, the ethnic concentration is 17% and there are still neighborhoods in which more than 75% of the total of residents has a non-western immigrant background. So the act did not have a significant effect (CBS, 2017).

Overview for Rotterdam

In the table down below (3), an overview is given of all the data described above. This is done, in the same way as for Amsterdam. The same explanation that has been given in the prior overview, also accounts for this one.

Integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background		<i>Past</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>Average personal Income (on annual basis)</i>		20.100€	21.000€	+4%
<i>Labor market participation</i>		51%	52%	+1%
<i>Education level (secondary education)</i>	Practical/vocational training	13%	13%	0
	Preparatory secondary vocational education (VMBO)	52%	53%	+1%
	Senior general secondary school (Havo)	20%	20%	0
	Pre-university education (VWO),	15%	14%	-1%
<i>Education level (After secondary education)</i>	vocational education (mbo)	55%	52%	-3%
	Higher education (hbo)	30%	33%	+3%
	Acedemic education (wo)	15%	15%	0
<i>Level of ethnic concentration</i>		18%	17%	-1%

Table 3

4.1.3 The Hague

The Hague is the third biggest municipality in the Netherlands. In addition, the municipality also has much international appearance because of the presence of many international organizations such as the International Court of Justice and International Criminal Court. As a result, many organizations, knowledge institutes and companies settle in the city which causes for a greater attractiveness of residents for the city (CBS, 2017; Den Haag, 2017). This also has an effect on the composition of the population in the city, which is considered diverse. Just like Amsterdam, The Hague decided to not have an integration policy specifically focused on ethnicity. In the past The Hague relied the emphasis on citizenship and diversity and this was supposed to replace the concept of integration. However, there still was a specific approach and integration was not completely dismissed from policies and programs. For instance, just like Amsterdam and Rotterdam, The Hague participated in the Antillean and Moroccan program. Furthermore, The Hague designed an integration policy in 2010, which was not in line with the approach taken by the national government and many other local governments. While many municipalities were moving away from the approach of integration based on ethnic groups, The Hague decided not to follow this trend but kept on aiming the policy on certain groups. For instance, one of the explicit goals of the policy was to expand the participation of immigrants. However, Huinder states that many of the other municipalities in theory may have decided to move away from focusing on ethnic groups but in practice still were similar to The Hague (Coello, Dagevos, Huinder, van der Leun, & Odé, 2013; Ham & van der Meer, 2012; Gemeente Den Haag, 2014). This however has changed to some extent. The current policy focuses on counteracting polarization, participation of ethnic minority groups and ensuring the acceptance of the diversity within the municipality. Furthermore, the municipality states that it focuses on both the native residents and immigrants when it comes to integration which is unlike Rotterdam that mainly focuses on immigrants (Baldewsingh, 2015).

The integration policy was designed since almost half of the residents in Te Hague are of non-Dutch origin which is expected to expand over the years. For instance, in 2010 there were 234.693 residents in The Hague with an immigrant background versus 253.860 residents without an immigrant background. The group of residents with an immigrant background consisted mainly out those with a non-western background, namely 163.945 persons (34%). The largest groups based on origin are those out of Surinam and Turkey. This has increased and currently the municipality has 52% of residents with an immigrant background of which 35% is of non-western origin(181.996). For this particular group of residents, the integration has been described with the help of the framework presented in the section 2.3, Conceptualization (CBS, 2017; Gemeente Den Haag, 2014).

As is done for Amsterdam and Rotterdam, average personal income (on an annual basis) is the first aspect up for discussion. The Hague had 363.100 residents with an income in 2010. The average personal income of these residents was 29.400 Euros. This was more similar to Amsterdam but was 11% higher than the average income in Rotterdam. The group with a non-western immigrant background earned way below this average. Their average personal income on an annual basis was 21.300 Euros. In 2014, their average income went up to 22.300 Euros. However, the average personal income of residents without an immigrant background and western immigrant background also increased and the general income in The Hague rose up to 30.800 Euros. So even though the

incomes of residents with a non-western immigrant background went up, it does not necessarily mean a higher level of integration (CBS, 2016).

Second aspect of the framework of integration is labor market participation. The labor market participation is often an indicator for the income of residents. This is because of income consisting for a great deal out of the earnings conceived from participating on the labor market. Both of these aspects will contribute to a better social-economic position in society. Therefore, participation on the labor market is seen as an important indicator for integration (Dagevos, 2001; CBS, n.d.). The participation of the total of residents in The Hague in 2010 was 63%. This percentage was higher than that of Rotterdam but lower than Amsterdam. This also counts for the participation of residents with a non-western immigrant background, which is 57% and therefore lower than in Amsterdam but higher than in Rotterdam. The percentage of persons with this particular background not participating in the labor market declined over the years. In 2016, approximately 55% of this group was active on the labor market. The rise of inactivity on the labor market has an effect on the entitlement of benefits. This rise is mainly caused in The Hague by residents with a Moroccan and Antillean background. These two groups were 3 to 4 times more eligible to benefits (CBS, 2017; Gemeente Den Haag, 2014). Furthermore, there is also an increase of refugees which has an effect on this as well since they are categorized underneath the residents with a non-western immigrant background (Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland, n.d.). The labor market participation in general in The Hague decreased to 60.5% (CBS, 2017).

The third aspect of structural integration presented in the framework is education. When it comes to education, The Hague does fairly well. Urban areas in general are often linked with having higher educated people living and working in these areas. Just like Amsterdam and Rotterdam, The Hague is also considered an urban area. Therefore, this should correlate with a higher amount of higher educated people than other non-urban areas. However, The Hague does have a lesser amount of higher educated people than Amsterdam. A reason for this can be that there are no universities in The Hague unlike Amsterdam. This means that a lot of the students wanting to attend this level of education, move to other places where there are universities (Compendium voor de Leefomgeving, 2016; Gemeente Den Haag, 2014). The education level of especially non-western immigrants is low. In The Hague, 23.834 students had attended secondary education in 2009/2010, divided into 10.376 students without any immigrant background, 2248 students with a western background and 10.898 with a non-western immigrant background. Of the 10.898 students with a non-western immigrant background, 51% attended preparatory secondary vocational education. Only 16% of the total of this group attended pre-university education. However there has been some progress made over the years. Less students attended preparatory secondary vocation education and more attended pre-university education. Looking at the post education, there is also a positive progress to be noted. Fewer students with a non-western immigrant background attend vocational education compared to the past. Furthermore, more these students are also attending academic education (CBS, 2017). For exact percentages of the education level, added is an overview at the end of this section.

The third aspect of the framework is ethnic concentration which revolves within this study around the high concentration of immigrants in a certain neighborhood of a city. As been stated before, this concentration causes for less interaction between ethnic groups and tensions, which is the reason for

it being seen as harmful for the integration of especially immigrants (Gijsberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010). Over the years, The Hague had a decline in ethnic concentrated neighborhoods. For instance, in 2010, The Hague had 153 neighborhoods with residents according to the Central Bureau of Statistics. There were 26 neighborhoods with an overrepresentation of persons with non-western immigrant background. There are even ten neighborhoods, such as Schildersbuurt and Transvaalkwartier, which consisted mainly out of non-western immigrant (>75%). In total, the ethnic concentration of the municipality The Hague amounted to 17% (CBS, 2014). Currently, there are less ethnic concentrated neighborhoods compared to the past. In 2016, the ethnic concentration in The Hague amounted to 16%. However, there are still 10 neighborhoods in which more than 75% of the residents are of non-western origin. This is more than in Amsterdam and Rotterdam.

Overview for The Hague

As is done for Rotterdam & Amsterdam in the previous sections of this chapter, an overview is presented. The same explanation given in these previous sections also apply here.

Integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background		<i>Past</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>Average personal Income (on annual basis)</i>		21.300€	22.300€	+5%
<i>Labor market participation</i>		57%	55%	-2%
<i>Education level (secondary education)</i>	Practical/vocational training	12%	11%	-1%
	Preparatory secondary vocational education (VMBO)	51%	48%	-3%
	Senior general secondary school (Havo)	21%	24%	+3%
	Pre-university education (VWO),	16%	17%	+1%
<i>Education level (After secondary education)</i>	vocational education (mbo)	49%	45%	-4%
	Higher education (hbo)	37%	40%	+3%
	Acedemic education (wo)	14%	15%	+1%
<i>Level of ethnic concentration</i>		17%	16%	-1%

Table 4

4.1.4 Utrecht

Utrecht is one of the four main municipalities that is part of the Randstad. It is also one of the most important access points of the Randstad. Especially, the Central Station of Utrecht is noted as the largest transport hub in the Netherlands. Therefore, Utrecht takes a prominent role in the national and even international infrastructure network. Since Utrecht is such a major player within society, it attracts many people. This also means that it attracts people with different backgrounds. The municipality of Utrecht acknowledges this diversity of the Utrechtse Society. This approach was captured in the policies of the past and the current one, which differ not a lot from each other. For instance, in 2010, Utrecht had an integration/diversity policy which revolved mainly around increasing active participation and inclusion by all. The policy was not only geared towards citizens with an immigrant background. This becomes clearer by the other focus points of the policy. One of the points brought forward was increasing social-economic position. The projects installed to do so were not only geared towards immigrants but also on other groups that are in need of it. The current policy has a similar approach and according to the municipality, it is mainly focused on achieving inclusivity of all residents. Achieving equality and full participation of all groups is the end goal of this policy. However, the municipality does not completely exclude a focus on ethnic minorities. The municipalities for instance states that it will support immigrant organizations because of it being of value to society (Coello, Dagevos, Huinder, van der Leun, & Odé, 2013; Utrecht Convention Bureau, n.d.; Gemeente Utrecht, 2006).

The municipality of Utrecht speaks of having a diverse city with including 235 different ethnical backgrounds. Almost a third of the residents had an immigrant background according to the municipality. For instance, in 2010, there were 65.512 residents with a non-western immigrant background which equals to 21% of all residents in Utrecht having this particular background. Over the years, an increase is to be noted. In 2016, Utrecht consisted of 338.967 residents. Of these 338.967 residents, a third had an immigrant background. The residents with an immigrant background can be divided into two groups, which are the residents with a western immigrant background and residents with a non-western immigrant background. The last group was the largest group with 74.572 persons, equaling to 22% of the total of residents in Utrecht having this background. So relatively there are more residents with a non-western immigrant background in Utrecht. However, this amount is much lower than the other three municipalities for which the percentages are above the 30%. Of the 235 different ethnical backgrounds in Utrecht, Moroccan and Turkish were the largest groups (Gemeente Utrecht, 2006; CBS, 2017).

Of the 307.081 residents in Utrecht, in 2010, 240.300 persons had an income. The average personal income of these persons was 29.400 Euros. The group earning the least on an average basis was the residents with a non-western immigrant background. This group existed of 43.000 residents with an income. Their average personal income was 20.600 Euros. Just like the other three municipalities, this groups' earnings are categorized within the lower incomes according to the Internal Revenue Service (Belastingdienst, n.d.; CBS, 2016; CBS, 2017). Currently, the average income of this group is still within the category of lower incomes. Their income at the moment is approximately 21.700 Euros. Not only have their incomes increased but also the incomes of other residents without a non-western immigrant background. In general, the average personal income in Utrecht has increased to

31.200 Euros (on an annual basis). Compared to other municipalities in the Netherlands, this amount of income is pretty average (CBS, 2016).

The average personal income consists for a great part out of earnings from participating on the labor market. The labor market participation of Utrecht is relatively high compared to other municipalities within the Randstad (approximately 70%). Often, reasons given for lower labor market participation in bigger cities is related to the higher amount of residents with a non-western immigrant background in those places. Yet, the labor market participation was higher for these particular residents in Utrecht than in many other municipalities including some of the ones being researched in this study. The participation of residents with a non-western immigrant background, in 2010, in Utrecht was 59%. However, over the years the labor market participation of this group declined and currently their participation is 57%. This is lower than the participation of the residents in Amsterdam but still higher than especially Rotterdam. Reason for Utrecht having a relatively higher labor market participation in comparison to other municipalities could be appointed to the education level of its residents (CBS, 2017; CBS, 2014).

The education level has an effect on the possible success one can have on the labor market. Since Utrecht had a high percentage of labor market participation compared to the other municipalities (with exception of Amsterdam), expected is higher education levels. Secondary education in the Netherlands can be divided into four main levels, pre-university education (vwo) as the highest level, followed by senior general secondary school (havo), preparatory secondary vocational education (vmbo) and lastly practical/vocational training which is classed as the lowest education level. In 2009/2010, 11.598 students attended secondary education. As stated before, the focus for this study is on the grades 3 and onwards. There were, 2366 students with a non-western immigrant background in 2009/2010 attending grade 3 and onwards. Most of these student, to be exact 53%, attended preparatory secondary vocational education. Over the years this has increased and currently more students attend this level of education and less attend pre-university education which is the highest level of secondary education. So a decline is to be noticed over the years for students with a non-western immigrant background in secondary education. However, there is a positive development in the post secondary education for these students. Less of these students are attending vocational education and more are represented in academic education. The amount of students with a non-western immigrant background attending university is higher than in the other cities (CBS, 2017). In general, Utrecht is known for having high educated citizens compared to other municipalities (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2011).

The last aspect of the framework is ethnic concentration of immigrants in neighborhoods. It is proven that a high concentration in a neighborhood of a specific group, more so non-western immigrants, causes for less interaction with others and decreases overall integration (Gijsberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010). Compared with the other three municipalities, Utrecht has a much lower rate of ethnic concentrated neighborhoods. In 2010, Utrecht had 118 neighborhoods with residents according to the CBS. There were 5 neighborhoods with an overrepresentations of non-western immigrants. The neighborhood Kanaleneiland, especially had a high concentration of residents with a non-western immigrant background. In total, the ethnic concentration level of

Utrecht amounted to 4 % of neighborhoods with an overrepresentation of residents with a non-western immigrant background (CBS, 2014). Unlike the other municipalities, where there was a decline over the years to be noted of the amount of ethnic concentrated neighborhoods, in Utrecht this is increasing. Currently, the ethnic concentration of the municipality amount to 6%, which is higher than the past situation (CBS, 2017).

Overview for Utrecht

As is done for the three other municipalities, an overview is presented of Utrecht. The aspects provided in the section 2.3, conceptualization are used as a base. However, some changes are made which is also already explained in the other overviews.

Integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background		<i>Past</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Change</i>
<i>Average personal income (on an annual basis)</i>		20.600€	21.700€	+5%
<i>Labor market participation</i>		59%	57%	-2%
<i>Education level (secondary education)</i>	Practical/vocational training	11%	10%	-1%
	Preparatory secondary vocational education (vmbo)	53%	54%	+1%
	Senior general secondary school (Havo)	20%	21%	+1%
	Pre-university education (vwo),	16%	15%	-1%
<i>Education level (After secondary education)</i>	vocational education (mbo)	49%	42%	-5%
	Higher education (hbo)	29%	33%	+4%
	Academic education (wo)	22%	25%	+3%
<i>Level of ethnic concentration</i>		4%	6%	+2%

Table 5

4.2 What differences are to be noted between the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background in these four municipalities

In the previous section, data of the integration of residents of the four municipalities are presented. More specifically, data on aspects of the past integration and the current integration have been put into tables. Out of this, either progress, a decline or no change at all in a particular aspect of integration has become clear. This has been put in a column described as change. This column is of importance for this section and is the base of which the comparison between the municipalities lays. Reason for this is that one of the aims of this study is to compare the integration progress of the four municipalities. This column of each municipality combined will provide this information and is therefore chosen. The differences that become apparent from this will further be examined by looking at what the possible causes are derived from the literature. This last part is done in section 4.3.

Integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background		<i>Amsterdam</i>	<i>Rotterdam</i>	<i>Den Haag</i>	<i>Utrecht</i>
<i>Average personal income (on an annual basis)</i>		+5%	+4%	+5%	+5%
<i>Labor market participation</i>		+2%	+1%	-2%	-2%
<i>Education level (secondary education)</i>	Practical/vocational training	-1%	0	-1%	-1%
	Preparatory secondary vocational education (vmbo)	-4%	+1%	-3%	+1%
	Senior general secondary school (Havo)	+4%	0	+3%	+1%
	Pre-university education (vwo),	+1%	-1%	+1%	-1%
<i>Education level (After secondary education)</i>	Vocational education (mbo)	-7%	-3%	-4%	-7%
	Higher education (hbo)	+4%	+3%	+3%	+4%
	Academic education	+3%	0	+1%	+3%
<i>Level of ethnic concentration</i>		-2%	-1%	-1%	+2%

Table 6

Out of table 6, it becomes clear that Amsterdam is showing a positive development on all aspects of integration over the years. The average personal income and labor market participation of residents with a non-western immigrant background has risen over the years. There are also less students attending the lowest level of education such as a practical/vocational training, preparatory secondary vocational education and vocational education. More students with this particular background are attending the higher levels of education which is for instance shown by an increase of 3% in those attending academic education compared to the past. Furthermore, the ethnic concentration has also decreased with 2% which is a positive outcome for the social integration.

Residents with a non-western immigrant background in Rotterdam on the other hand are showing less positive developments over the years on the aspects of integration, especially compared to Amsterdam. The average personal income of these residents in Rotterdam has not increased as much as in the other three municipalities. Furthermore, a decline is to be noticed in the secondary education levels of students with a non-western immigrant background. Compared to the past, less of these students are attending pre-university education and more are attending preparatory secondary vocational education. Also, in the post-secondary education, other municipalities show more improvement as is shown by the greater percentage increase.

Residents in The Hague with a non-western immigrant background are showing more integration progress than those in Rotterdam. There is however one exception to this, which is related to the labor market participation. Compared to the past, less residents with a non-western immigrant background in The Hague are participating on the labor market which negatively affects the integration. Nevertheless, on other aspects of integration they are showing a positive development. Less students of non-western origin are attending the lowest levels of education and more are attending the higher forms. Furthermore, there is also less ethnic concentrated neighborhoods which is good for the social integration.

Lastly, the residents in Utrecht with a non-western immigrant background are showing a positive development on certain aspects of integration. Especially, the post-secondary education of students is progressing well since there is an increase in students in the academic education and less students attending vocational education. However, residents with a non-western immigrant background in Utrecht are participating less on the labor market and the secondary education level is also decreasing compared to the past. Furthermore there is also an increase in ethnic concentrated neighborhoods. It is good to add that they do have a very low ethnic concentration level compared to other municipalities. Nevertheless, an increase in ethnic concentrated neighborhoods has negative effects on the integration.

So, overall residents with a non-western immigrant in Amsterdam are showing more progress over the years than in the other three municipalities. Especially residents in Utrecht and Rotterdam are showing little to no positive development compared to the past.

4.3 Expectations from the literature in line with the results from this study?

In 2.1.2, expectations were described that came forward out of the scientific literature. The results however show that the expectations described in 2.1.2 are not completely correct. The first expectation that came forward out of the literature and debate is that the integration process of residents with a non-western immigrant background has not improved over the years (CBS, 2014; Scheffer, 2000; Slegers, 2007). There were several causes provided for why this has not been proceeding well. This expectation partially became clear within this study. Not in all of the four municipalities, a progress is noticed on all aspects of integration over time. Only residents with a non-western immigrants living in Amsterdam are showing a positive development on all factors of integration. In addition, they also show more progress over the years than the other three municipalities. The other three municipalities showed a positive development on some aspects,

however it was not the Same as for Amsterdam. There were also aspects for which there was not a positive development at all but a decline was to be noticed. This accounts especially for Rotterdam and Utrecht. The residents with a non-western immigrant background in the Hague show a little less progress than Amsterdam but more than Rotterdam and Utrecht.

The second expectation was that residents with a non-western immigrant background living in municipalities with a specific and strict approach towards integration will have less of a positive development (in regards to the integration) over the years than those that do not have such an approach. This expectation came out. Rotterdam always had a pretty strict approach to immigrants and integration which has probably been caused by the political parties of the city council. In Rotterdam, the political parties that have the most seats in the city council can be categorized more on the conservative side of the political spectrum. Often such parties are known for having a more strict and harsh approach towards immigrants. Furthermore, the integration policy of Rotterdam focuses clearly on immigrants (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2015; NOS, 2014). This approach was seen as negatively affecting the integration (Sleegers, 2007). The Hague and Utrecht also still focus to some extent on specific groups within their integration policies. Amsterdam is the only one who has completely moved away from this approach (Coello, Dagevos, Huinder, van der Leun, & Odé, 2013). The residents with a non-western immigrant background in this municipality also show more development on almost all aspect of integration compared to the other municipalities.

The third expectation was that municipalities in which there is relatively more segregation of groups, will show less progress regarding the integration of immigrants in time. This is not completely true. For instance, data within this study has shown that Utrecht does not have a lot of neighborhoods with a high percentage of immigrants. Ethnic concentrated neighborhoods are related to spatial segregation. So, since Utrecht does not have a lot of these neighborhoods and therefore less segregation, expected is that residents of non-western origin would show more of an integration progress. Nevertheless, the municipalities Amsterdam and The Hague with a higher percentage of ethnic concentrated neighborhood show more of an overall positive development. Furthermore, the ethnic concentration level in Utrecht is also rising which will cause for more spatial segregation and therefore for less integration. Spatial segregation has as a negative effect because of it resulting in less interethnic contact. More interethnic contact between different groups causes for less fear towards immigrants and a better understanding. This than results in less discrimination and feelings of exclusion. Discrimination and exclusion can cause for less opportunities and less motivation to be an active participants of society (Gijsberts, Vervoorts, Havekes, & Dagevos, 2010).

The last expectation was that municipalities with economic structures revolving around the industrial sector will show less positive development in regards to the integration of non-western immigrants. This is true to some extent and mostly accounts for Amsterdam and Rotterdam. In general, literature and data shows that Amsterdam has overall been doing better on social-economic factors than other municipalities within the Randstad. So it is not just residents with a non-western immigrant background that score higher on aspects as provided in the framework, but also other residents with and without an immigrant background. Rotterdam, shows less positive development over the years in regards to the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background. One of the main reasons for this difference between the two biggest municipalities in the Netherlands has to do,

according to many scholars such as Hentzinger & Scheffer, with the history of the cities. Amsterdam is known as a city of which the economy has always and mainly been based on trading, financial services and commercial services. In addition to this economical side, the city also has a rich cultural life and attracts a lot of tourists. For Rotterdam things have been different due to the economic structure, it especially had in the past. Rotterdam has been known as an industrial city, with its population mainly working in this sector. Due to globalization and the technical evolution, Rotterdam has stayed behind and is being threatened with aging. The economic structure of the city still leans on the industrial side and is still considered rather unilateral. In the past, many non-western immigrants came to the Netherlands to do this type of work. So since this type of work is becoming less, it therefore also heavily affects them and especially the first generation of non-western immigrants. This group often has had little to no education and therefore is bound with this type of industrial work. All of this may explain why the labor market participation of residents with a non-western immigrant group is progressing more in Amsterdam than it is in Rotterdam. Furthermore, Amsterdam having such a different economic structure and it being a tourist attraction, also results in more employment opportunities. More companies and entrepreneurs will settle in Amsterdam, which affects the labor market in a positive way (Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012).

However, this expectation regarding the economic positions is not completely correct for The Hague and Utrecht. These cities are expected to attract more companies and entrepreneurs than Rotterdam. Reason for this is the central location of Utrecht in the Netherlands and The Hague having an international allure due to the (inter-governmental) organizations that are settled there. More companies and entrepreneurs will result in more labor market opportunities, also for residents with a non-western immigrant background (Den Haag, 2017; Utrecht Convention Bureau, n.d.). However, both these municipalities show a decline in labor market participation.

So the expectations that came forward out of the literature have not all come out. Especially for residents with a non-western immigrant background in Utrecht, expected was more of an integration progress.

Conclusion

Within this study, it has become apparent that there is not a progress to be noticed on all aspects of integration over the years. Only residents with a non-western immigrant background in Amsterdam have showed a positive development on all aspects of integration (as described within this study) in time. Especially the municipalities, Rotterdam and Utrecht show a negative development in the integration over the years. Residents with a non-western immigrant background in Rotterdam for instance have a smaller percentage increase regarding income compared to the other municipalities and also there is not an improvement to be noticed in the level of secondary education. Utrecht also shows less improvement when it comes to the secondary education. There is an increase of these students attending preparatory secondary vocational education and a decrease of those attending pre-university education. Furthermore, Utrecht also has an increase of ethnic concentrated

neighborhoods and less residents with a non-western immigrant background participating on the labor market. These results for Utrecht are remarkable since the city is often known for having higher educated persons and attracting more companies. Expected was more of an integration progress, but almost the opposite is happening. They show on certain aspects even more of a decline in integration than Rotterdam. Residents in Rotterdam with a non-western immigrant background are expected (according to literature) to show little progress since their economic structure is heavily based on the industry sector and their strict approach to immigrants. Amsterdam is the only municipality that is showing an improvement on all aspects of integration (Scheffer, Entzinger, Louwes, & van Es, 2012; Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2011)

So the data within this study for integration does not show a progress on all aspects of integration. This is in line with the view presented in the societal and scientific debate that mostly presents a negative perspective on the integration of residents with a non-western immigrant background (Slegers, 2007; Scheffer, 2000; CBS, 2014; DUO Onderwijsonderzoek, 2017) However, there was a large influx in 2015 of refugees in 2015. Often these refugees are part of the population with non-western immigrant background (Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland, n.d.; CBS, n.d.) Therefore, the reason why there is not an improvement to be noticed on all aspects may be affected by this whole new group of persons for which the integration process has just begun. So it is possible that there would be a positive development of the integration if there was not such a large influx. Furthermore, the literature shows much criticism on the specific approach in which according to many scholars residents with a non-western immigrant group are being stigmatized. This is done by the wording and tone of the policies (Slegers, 2007). The only municipality which choose to completely move away from this approach is Amsterdam (Coello, Dagevos, Huinder, van der Leun, & Odé, 2013). This also the only municipality in which residents with a non-western immigrant background are improving on all aspects of integration. So the critique on the specific and strict approach in the integration policy can be seen as acceptable.

Within this study, most of the focus has been on structural integration and the social-economic factors that affect this. This can be seen as a weakness of this study since not all aspects of integration have been researched. The issue with this was that data available on these aspects, either did not fit the time period or were too subjective. For instance, cultural integration refers to norms and values of the native population being taken over by residents with an immigrant background. The problem with this aspect is that the norms and values within the native population even show a large variation (Gijssberts & Dagevos, 2005). Therefore, this aspect was not taken into account. In the future, studies related to this subject could provide with more objective measures so that a more objective overall view on the integration level can be added to the scientific literature.

References

- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2011). *Jaarboek onderwijs in cijfers*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/-/media/imported/documents/2011/44/2011-f162-pub.pdf?la=nl-nl>
- Compendium voor de Leefomgeving. (2016). *Hoogopgeleiden, 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.clo.nl/indicatoren/nl2100-opleidingsniveau-bevolking>
- Planbureau voor Leefomgeving. (2016). *Sterke banengroei in Nederlandse steden, maar werklozen profiteren niet*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbl.nl/nieuws/nieuwsberichten/2016/sterke-banengroei-in-nederlandse-steden-maar-werklozen-profileren-niet>
- Abdou, M., & Gilbert, N. (2009). *Modelling the Emergence and Dynamics of Social and Workplace Segregation**. Retrieved from http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/811979/1/796883Abdou_Gilbert-final-3.pdf
- Asscher, L. (2014). *Kamerbrief bij de rapportages Antilliaanse-Nederlanders en Marokkaanse-Nederlanders*. Retrieved from Wegwijzer Jeug en Veiligheid: <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/bestanden/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2014/05/23/aanbiedingsbrief-rapportages-antilliaanse-en-marokkaanse-nederlanders/aanbiedingsbrief-rapportages-antilliaanse-en-marokkaanse-nederlanders.pdf>
- Baldewsingh, R. (2015). *Hoofddlijnenbrief Integratie*. Retrieved from <https://denhaag.raadsinformatie.nl/document/3342306/1/RIS280888%20Hoofddlijnenbrief%20integratie>
- Belastingdienst. (n.d.). *Ik ben 23 jaar of ouder, maar jonger dan de AOW-leeftijd*. Retrieved from <https://www.belastingdienst.nl/wps/wcm/connect/bldcontentnl/belastingdienst/prive/toeslagen/huurttoeslag/huurttoeslag-2017/voorwaarden-2017/ik-woon-alleen/23-of-ouder-jonger-dan-aow-leeftijd>
- Booi, H., Laan, N., Lindeman, E., & Slot, J. (2011). *Diversiteits- en integratiemonitor 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.ois.amsterdam.nl/pdf/2011_diversiteitsmonitor_2010.pdf
- CBS. (2017, February 14). *Arbeidsdeelname; regionale indeling 2016*. Retrieved from CBS Statline: <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=83524ned&D1=15&D2=0,6,9&D3=72,176,336,382&D4=5-7,11-13&HDR=G3,G1,G2&STB=T&VW=T>
- CBS. (n.d.). *Begrippen*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/begrippen?tab=n#id=niet-westerse-allochtoon>
- CBS. (n.d.). *Begrippen*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/begrippen?tab=p#id=persoonlijk-inkomen>
- CBS. (n.d.). *Begrippen*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/begrippen#id=arbeidspositie>
- CBS. (2016, November 21). *Bevolking naar migratieachtergrond*. Retrieved Juli 1, 2017, from CBS: <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/achtergrond/2016/47/bevolking-naar-migratieachtergrond>

CBS. (2017). *Bevolking; ontwikkeling in gemeenten met 100 000 of meer inwoners*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=70748NED&D1=0,2,4,16,18,20,22,24&D2=a&D3=0&D4=a&D5=l&HD=090707-1905&HDR=T&STB=G4,G2,G1,G3>

CBS. (2017). *Bevolking; ontwikkeling in gemeenten met 100 000 of meer inwoners*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=70748NED&D1=0,2,4,16,18,20,22,24&D2=a&D3=0&D4=5,15,24,26&D5=10,l&HDR=T&STB=G4,G2,G1,G3&VW=T>

CBS. (n.d.). *Gemeentegrootte en stedelijkheid*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/classificaties/overig/gemeentegrootte-en-stedelijkheid>

CBS. (2016, December 16). *Gemiddeld inkomen van personen naar kenmerken en naar regio*. Retrieved July 3, 2017, from CBS Statline: <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=80500ned&D1=0,2&D2=0&D3=0,22-24&D4=125,250,451,508&D5=6,l&HDR=G1,G2,T&STB=G3,G4&VW=T>

CBS. (2014, November 19). *Integratie verloopt moeizaam*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2014/47/integratie-verloopt-moeizaam>

CBS. (2014). *Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2009-2012*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=70904ned&D1=3,25-31&D2=6136-6137,6139-6143,6145-6148,6150,6152,6154-6156,6158-6162,6177,6179-6184,6199,6204-6208,6216,6221,6224,6235-6238,6245,6247-6250,6265,6267-6280,6288-6339&D3=1&HDR=T&STB=G1,G2&V>

CBS. (2014). *Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2009-2012*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=70904ned&D1=3,25-31&D2=9417-9418,9420-9425,9427-9468,9471-9495,9497-9504,9506-9533&D3=1&HDR=T&STB=G1,G2&VW=T>

CBS. (2014). *Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2009-2012*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=70904ned&D1=3,25-31&D2=8698-8856&D3=1&HDR=T&STB=G1,G2&VW=T>

CBS. (2014). *Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2009-2012*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=70904ned&D1=3,25-31&D2=5586,5588-5599,5611,5613,5615,5625,5627,5629,5631-5638,5640-5644,5652,5654,5656-5659,5661-5672,5685-5698,5714,5726-5736,5738-5746,5754-5761,5770-5785,5794-5806&D3=1&HDR=T&STB=G1>

CBS. (2017, March 1). *Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2015*. Retrieved from CBS Statline: <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=83220ned&D1=4,16-17&D2=4847-4968,5268-5373,7373-7531,8047-8161&HDR=T&STB=G1&VW=T>

CBS. (2017, August 2). *Leerlingen, deelnemers en studenten; onderwijssoort, woonregio*. Retrieved from CBS Statline: <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=71450ned&D1=0&D2=0&D3=0&D4=0-6,8,16-17&D5=a&D6=128,288,530,599&D7=9,15&HDR=G1,T,G2,G4,G6,G5&STB=G3&VW=T>

- Coello, L., Dagevos, J., Huinder, C., van der Leun, J., & Odé, A. (2013). *Het minderhedenbeleid voorbij. Motieven en gevolgen*. Retrieved from <http://www.oopen.org/download?type=document&docid=455990>
- Dagevos. (2001). *Perspectief op integratie. Over de sociaal-culturele en structurele integratie van etnische minderheden in Nederland*. Retrieved from www.oopen.org/download?type=document&docid=439743
- Dagevos, J., & Gijsberts, M. (2007). *Jaarrapport Integratie 2007*. Retrieved from <https://www.scp.nl/dsresource?objectid=8e142fcd-4b92-4970-8484-2a26e6010054&type=org>
- Dagevos, J., & Grundel, M. (2013, October 17). *Biedt het concept integratie nog perspectief?* Retrieved from Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau: https://www.scp.nl/Publicaties/Alle_publicaties/Publicaties_2013/Biedt_het_concept_integratie_nog_perspectief
- de Boom, J., van Wensveen, P., Weltevrede, A., Hermus, P., Seidler, Y., & van San, M. (2011). *Antilliaanse en Marokkaanse Nederlanders in Amsterdam 2011*. Retrieved from https://www.wegwijzerjeugdenveiligheid.nl/fileadmin/w/wegwijzerjeugdenveiligheid_nl/oudesite/doc/overlast_mn_jongeren/monitors/2011/antilliaanse-en-marokkaanse-nederlanders-in-amsterdam-2011.pdf
- de Bruijn, H. (2011, September). *Framing: over macht van taal in de politiek*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.nl/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=39HHAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT3&dq=macht+van+taal&ots=r2gdJM99tC&sig=BwonEw02tFZV3r6TZ1d54Mqi1Q#v=onepage&q=macht%20van%20taal&f=false>
- De Witte, K., Cabus, S., Groot, W., & van den Brink, H. M. (2014). *Voortijdig schoolverlaten. Rapportage van TIER/Platform31*. Retrieved from https://www.platform31.nl/uploads/media_item/media_item/23/81/voortijdig_schoolverlaten-1400572255.pdf
- Demant, F. (2005). *Meer inpassing dan aanpassing. Over de culturele integratie van migranten in Nederland en Duitsland*. Retrieved from <http://www.migrantenstudies.nl/wp-content/uploads/MS-2005-NR2-P70-86.pdf>
- Den Haag. (2017). *Den Haag, internationale stad van vrede en recht*. Retrieved from <https://www.denhaag.nl/nl/bestuur-en-organisatie/stad-van-vrede-en-recht/den-haag-internationale-stad-van-vrede-en-recht.htm>
- DUO Onderwijsonderzoek. (2017). *Rapportage integratie op school*. Retrieved from <http://www.duo-onderwijsonderzoek.nl/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Rapportage-Integratie-op-school-1-februari-2017.pdf>
- DWARS onderwijscommissie. (2011). *Segregatie in het onderwijs*. Retrieved from <https://dwars.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Onderwijsvisie-deel-2-2.pdf>

- Ederveen, S., Dekker, P., van der Horst, A., Joosten, W., van der Meer, T., Tang, P., et al. (2004, September 21). *Bestemming Europa*. Retrieved from CPB Economische beleidsanalyse: <https://www.cpb.nl/sites/default/files/publicaties/download/europeseverkenningnl.pdf>
- Engbersen, G. (2014). *Van zijstroom tot hoofdstroom van beleid. Integratie als permanente opgave voor de stad Rotterdam*. Retrieved from <http://diversiteitrotterdam.nl/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Engbersen.vanzijstroom-laatste-versie.pdf>
- Europa Nu. (2011). *Geen verplichte inburgering meer voor Turken*. Retrieved from http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/viszqi1b62zv/nieuws/geen_verplichte_inburgering_meer_voor?ctx=vh6ukzb3nnt0
- Gemeente Amsterdam. (n.d.). *Diversiteit*. Retrieved from <https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/organisatie/sociaal/onderwijs-jeugd-zorg/diversiteit/>
- Gemeente Amsterdam. (n.d.). *Wat is laag inkomen en weinig vermogen*. Retrieved from <https://www.amsterdam.nl/werk-inkomen/pak-je-kans/laag-inkomen-weinig/>
- Gemeente Den Haag. (2014). *Haagse Integratiemonitor 2014 en aanbevelingen*. Retrieved from <https://denhaag.raadsinformatie.nl/document/3342308/1/073RIS271680%20Integratiemonitor%20en%20aanbevelingen>
- Gemeente Rotterdam. (2015). *Integratie 010*. Retrieved from <https://rotterdam.raadsinformatie.nl/document/2454890/2>
- Gemeente Rotterdam. (n.d.). *Laaggeletterdheid in Rotterdam*. Retrieved from <https://www.rotterdam.nl/wonen-leven/onderzoek-laaggeletterdheid/11-Factsheet-regionale-laaggeletterdheid-gemeente-Rotterdam.pdf>
- Gemeente Utrecht. (2006). *Utrecht voor elkaar*. Retrieved from https://www.utrecht.nl/fileadmin/uploads/documenten/7.extern/wob/-2016/2016-156_collegeakkoorden/collegeprogramma_2006-2010.pdf
- Gijsberts, M., & Dagevos, J. (2005). *Uit elkaars buurt*. Retrieved from <https://www.scp.nl/dsresource?objectid=7293921a-d66b-4281-8750-c2910542cec6&type=org>
- Gijsberts, M., Vervoorts, M., Havekes, E., & Dagevos, J. (2010, March 24). *Maakt de buurt verschil*. Retrieved Juni 3, 2017, from Sociaal en Cultuur Planbureau: <https://www.scp.nl/dsresource?objectid=1bebeab6-d040-46a4-98ce-739f390facda&type=org>
- Goderik, B., & Vrooman, C. (2016). *Waar wonen de armen in Nederland?* Retrieved from http://digitaal.scp.nl/armoedeinkaat2016/waar_wonen_de_armen_in_nederland/
- Ham, M., & van der Meer, J. (2012, February 10). *De ethnische bril. Categorisering in het integratiebeleid*. Retrieved from <http://www.nidi.nl/shared/content/output/books/nidi-book-84.pdf>
- Hu, L.-T., & Olshfski, D. (2007). *Describing and measuring phenomena in public administration*. Retrieved from

https://books.google.nl/books?id=QVkyCMZ4Ui4C&pg=PA205&lpg=PA205&dq=chapter+13+describing+and+measuring+phenomena+in+public+administration&source=bl&ots=5MUxwNGgaA&sig=rilQzLRiJaQatHknH7rZ_p3-ry4&hl=nl&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwir7OCjwsHSAhVDthoKHS6zALUQ6AEIJDAB#v=

Mattheijer, M. (2000). *De Toelating van Vluchtelingen in Nederland en hun Integratie op de Arbeidsmarkt*. Retrieved from http://archive.uva-aiaa.net/uploaded_files/publications/RR2-1.pdf

Nicolaas, H., Wobma, E., & Ooijevaar, J. (2010). *Demografie van (niet-westerse) allochtonen in Nederland*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/NR/rdonlyres/240E5858-D04D-47EA-9C22-AB8E9297E2D2/0/2010k4b15p22art.pdf>

Niemoller, J. (n.d.). *Wilders spreekt: Ik capituleer niet*. Retrieved from <https://www.pvv.nl/index.php/component/content/article/37-raymond-de>

Nieuwenhuizen, E. (2005). *Ruimtelijke segregatie in Nederland – Factsheet*. Retrieved from <http://www.art1.nl/nprd/factsheets/Ruimtelijke%20Segregatie%20in%20Nederland%202005.pdf>

NOS. (2014). *Gemeenteraadsverkiezingen*. Retrieved from <http://app.nos.nl/datavisualisatie/gemeenteraadsverkiezingen-2014/index.html>

Park, J. (2015, September 23). *Europe's Migration Crisis*. Retrieved from https://www.pravo.unizg.hr/_download/repository/semiunar_migrants.docx

Pinto, D. (2004). *Beeldvorming en integratie*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.nl/books?id=vchifeB7CMsC&pg=PA144&lpg=PA144&dq=integratiebeleid+te+zaacht&source=bl&ots=uLcmhY4xkf&sig=QTeTkS2-nb3y-#v=onepage&q=integratiebeleid%20te%20zaacht&f=false>

Ray, B. (2003). *The Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration*. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/role-cities-immigrant-integration>

Rijksoverheid. (n.d.). *Immigratie, integratie en inburgering*. Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/themas/immigratie-integratie-en-inburgering>

Rijksoverheid. (2011, June 16). *Integratienota Integratie, binding, burgerschap*. Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/binaries/rijksoverheid/documenten/beleidsnotas/2011/06/16/integratienota/integratienota.pdf>

Rijksoverheid. (n.d.). *Voortgezet onderwijs*. Retrieved from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/voortgezet-onderwijs>

Scheffer, P. (2000). *Het multiculturele drama*. Retrieved from http://www.themasonline.nl/opdrachten/opdracht/mc_samenleving/opdrachten/downloads/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20MULTICULT%20PAUL%20SCHEFFER%20definitief.pdf

Scheffer, P., Entzinger, H., Louwes, K., & van Es, A. (2012, March). *De staat van de integratie. Amsterdam Rotterdam*. Retrieved from http://www.ois.amsterdam.nl/pdf/2012_destaatvanintegratie.pdf

Schinkel, W. (2008). *De gedroomde samenleving*. Kampen: Klement.

Sleegers, F. (2007). *In debat over Nederland: Veranderingen in het discours over de multiculturele samenleving en nationale identiteit*. Retrieved from https://books.google.nl/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=qr2DhdGzopEC&oi=fnd&pg=PA5&dq=streng+integratie+beleid&ots=QcD2n3J7HA&sig=EFRyAYBv65Ux_eP0XQ8ajgOfpzQ#v=onepage&q=streng%20integratie+beleid&f=false

Snel, E. (2003, february 6). *Integratie minderheden is niet mislukt*. Retrieved from https://www.wbs.nl/system/files/snel_erik_integratie_minderheden_is_niet_mislukt_sd2003-1-2.pdf

Thiel, S. (2010). *Bestuurskundig onderzoek. Een methodologische inleiding*. Bussum: Coutinho.

Traag, T., van der Valk, J., van der Velden, R., de Vries, R., & Wolbers, M. (2004). *Een verklaring voor het effect van opleiding op de arbeidsmarktpositie van*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbs.nl/NR/rdonlyres/A2FC79D9-562B-416B-BD2C-D8BF5A9EF444/0/2004k3v4p026art.pdf>

Tweede Kamer der Staten- Generaal. (2004, January 19). *Onderzoek integratiebeleid*. Retrieved from overheid.nl: <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/kst-28689-9.html>

Utrecht Convention Bureau. (n.d.). *Bereikbaarheid*. Retrieved from <https://www.utrechtconventionbureau.nl/nl/plan-uw-event/bereikbaarheid>

Verhaeghe, P. P. (2010, February). *De discursieve kracht van het begrip 'allochtoon'*. Retrieved from <http://poliargus.be/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/De-discursieve-kracht-van-het-begrip-allochtoon.paper2010-02.pdf>

Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland. (n.d.). *Vluchtelingen in getallen 2015*. Retrieved from <https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/sites/public/Vluchtelingenwerk/Cijfers/VLUCHTELINGEN%20IN%20GETALLEN%202015%20definitiefst%20OO%2002092015.pdf>

Wansink, H. (2017, February 3). *Populistische revolutie*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.nl/books?id=N-MNDgAAQBAJ&pg=PT112&lpg=PT112&dq=Populistische+revolutie+hans+wansink+plaats+van+uitgeven&source=bl&ots=JfrDxZlxwk&sig=voREqLHS5QPktoScHkf23wHMn6g&hl=nl&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiu0dL2scrVAhVCZIAKHb9WCk0Q6AEIQDAE#v=onepage&q=Popu>