"COURSES DO NOT TEACH YOU HOW TO LIVE IN SOCIETY"

An explanatory case study on the added value of local solidarity initiatives to the integration of status holders

BY MAUD GROOTELAAR

Cover photo: one of the status holders in Delft.

Photo taken by DelftseBuur (March 13, 2017).

On the sign: "Een bericht van de Syrische man. We zijn in jullie land maar jullie zijn in onze hart. Als u te ondersteunen, geef me een knuffel en dank jullie wel." [A message from the Syrian man. We are in your country, but you are in our hearts. If you support this, give me a hug and thank you.

"Courses do not teach you how to live in society"

An exploratory case study on the added value of local solidarity initiatives to the integration of status holders

By Maud Grootelaar (1013218)

Under supervision of Prof. Dr. Henk van Houtum

Human Geography: Globalisation, Migration and Development

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Science

Radboud University

September 2018

Abstract

In the Netherlands, there are several citizens and organizations that take the initiative to express some kind of solidarity with status holders. With the integration policies moving towards a participation society, with more self-reliance on the citizens and more responsibilities for the status holders, it seems like the help of these initiatives are of great value. Yet, not all municipalities are aware of what these initiatives do and mean, and make use of or collaborate with the initiatives. This study examines the added value of local solidarity initiatives by looking at the kinds of help they offer, and by questioning what they mean to the municipalities, the status holders and the integration process. This is done by semi-structured interviews with twenty-eight representatives of initiatives and municipalities, and focus-groups with eleven status holders in three municipalities in the Netherlands: Delft, Haarlem and Leiden. By focussing on integration as a two-sided process and looking into the added value to this process from the perspective of status holders as well, three indicators of integration are used: finding a job, learning the Dutch language and being part of a community. The results of this study indicate that the initiatives are of great value for the integration process, especially when it comes to helping the status holders becoming part of a community. One of the reasons for this is that initiatives often have more time, energy and can deliver help that aligns with the needs of each individual status holder. Next to this, the focus of the initiatives is more on the social-cultural dimension whereas municipalities focus more often on the socio-economic dimension of integration. In this way, the initiatives fill the gaps in the integration policies, although the results of their efforts are not always measurable.

Preface

In front of you lies my thesis *"Courses do not teach you how to live in society"*, the final product of many hours of thinking, writing, discussing and rewriting. I have truly enjoyed talking with so many diverse people who mean so much to society during the collecting of my data in Haarlem, Leiden and Delft. Their efforts and energy have inspired me, and I am glad that this thesis creates the opportunity to display the importance of their hard work. Nonetheless, I have to admit there were also some less inspiring moments during the writing of this thesis, where I thought this process would never come to an end. But at last, it did. And now I look back at it, I feel that this challenge has been a good learning process and a great way of marking the end of my student life. I look forward to the next phase and all the new challenges.

But before I head off to my next challenge, I would like to thank a number of persons who have supported me during the process of writing this thesis. At first, my supervisor Henk van Houtum, for his critical feedback, interesting articles and pushing me in the right direction. And for advising me at each meeting to also take some days off. Secondly, my colleagues at Justice and Peace, Maaike and Liselot, for their guidance, and of course Edith, for the great collaboration, nice conversations and motivating words. At last, my sister, Hilke, for never not helping me with my papers, motivation letters, admission letters, and of course this thesis. Your critical and straight forward words have helped me to complete this thesis and pushed me to improve myself each and every time.

Table of contents

List of figures and/or tables

Chapter 1. Introduction

"Who am I? In Syria, I knew where I stood in society. And suddenly I do not know where I stand anymore. I'm no one here. Before being a part of society, you have to know who you are."

- Zahra (26) from Syria, living in Delft

"Courses do not teach you how to live in society."

- Katia (33) from Syria, living in Leiden

The two quotes above belong to two status holders (people with a residence permit for the Netherlands) I spoke with during my research, and reflect a small part of the challenges they had to overcome when they arrived in the Netherlands. Like other refugees coming to the Netherlands, Zahra and Katia had to follow the standard civic integration process of the government. The municipalities, that execute these policies, have discretionary power in the way they give substance to them. Some municipalities look at temporarily short-term solutions where other municipalities look at the managing of the influx of refugees on a long-term. Their views on integration have their consequences, not only on the fulfilment of refugees' basic needs but also on the integration into society. This means that for refugees, the municipality they get placed in is decisive for their following integration process. For Zahra and Katia, the integration policies of Delft and Leiden influenced their integration process from the moment they arrived there. But their integration process is not solely shaped by these formal institutions.

At this moment, the influx and integration of refugees cause a lot of commotion on various topics among many people: several European relations are under pressure, human rights are being violated, and tumult, fear and prejudice occur in society. European countries, such as Hungary and Slovakia, are fighting over the best deal on refugees: the fewer the refugees they have to take in, the better. Citizens are protesting against refugees, saying that refugees only come for economic benefits, they will take the jobs and costs an awful amount of money to

integrate. Words as "refugee crisis" or "asylum tsunami", and refugees described as "fortune seekers" display the negativity in the media on refugees coming to Europe (Volkskrant, 2015). A person would easily believe that solidarity in Europe has eroded. Yet, it seems like on the individual and local level solidarity is expressed fiercely. We have all seen the images of German citizens welcoming refugees at the train stations, shouting "say it loud, say it clear, refugees are welcome here!". And in the Netherlands, although integration policies have simplified and newspapers might show negative images of the general opinion, thousands of citizens have expressed solidarity by welcoming refugees and making them feel at home (VIDV, n.d.). In 2017, 77 percent of the Dutch population believed that the Netherlands should receive refugees who fled their country (CBS, 2018a). In many municipalities, including the municipalities of Zahra and Katia, local communities are involved by setting up initiatives to make the refugees feel at home. These initiatives are shaped in many different ways, depending on the size, the number of volunteers and their goals and express different kinds of solidarity with the refugees.

Engbersen, Dagevos, Jennissen, Bakker, and Leerkes (2015) show with their report that policy measures of municipalities often fall short in the Netherlands, but that the efforts of civil society can help overcome the obstacles of integration, such as creating more understanding and support in society. Bolt, Beneker, van Liempt, Visser & Zill (2017, p. 3) explain the importance of this solidarity from civil society, that "these efforts in the form of local, bottom-up policy initiatives function as bridge-builders between public authorities and target groups and fill important niches in public service provision." Refugees seem to be helped by these initiatives; through them they meet new people, get to know their place in society and build a social network. But does this really matter to the integration process of status holders? Remarkably, not much research is done on what these initiatives mean to the status holders, the municipality and foremost the integration process.

That is why this study aims to understand the role and added value of local solidarity in the integration process of status holders in three municipalities in the Netherlands. A lot of initiatives emerged with the influx of refugees in 2015, but what these initiatives do, if and how they complement municipalities and influence the integration process differs per municipality.

What these important niches are that Bolt, et al. (2017) talk about are not clear in their article and in the rest of the academic debate, and therefore relevant to look into with this study.

In the following paragraphs, I explain my research questions, the research context of this study, elaborate on current integration policies and the reasons why this study is relevant for society and science. In Chapter 2, the main concepts, such as integration, solidarity, the local civil society and status holders, are operationalised. Next to this, a theoretical framework gives an overview of and provide structure to the literature for this study. In Chapter 3, the methodology section, I explain how data is gathered and why I chose to do this in such ways. Followed by Chapter 4, where I describe the municipalities I researched, the actors that were interviewed and the formal institutions that exist in the municipalities. Chapter 4 ensures a basis of knowledge on the studied municipalities, through which Chapter 5 can be understood. In Chapter 5 the results of this study and the conclusions are described. This is done by focussing on the strengths of local initiatives and describing the challenges they are facing. The research questions are answered in Chapter 6, followed by the conclusion of this thesis, a reflection and recommendations.

1.1 Main objective and research question(s)

The main objective of this research is to explore and understand the roles and value that local initiatives have in the integration process of status holders and how the local solidarity initiatives complement each other and the integration policies. That is why the following research question will be answered:

What is the added value of local solidarity initiatives in Delft, Haarlem and Leiden to the integration processes of status holders?

This question is operationalized into two sub-questions:

1. Why do these local solidarity initiatives exist and what is their goal?

Focussing on the goals, size and scope of the initiatives, describing what their relevance is and why they have decided to show solidarity.

2. What are the experiences, challenges and successes that the local solidarity initiatives face in the integration process?

Focussing on the experiences, the challenges and successes of all the actors, including the municipality and status holders, in the integration process. Describing what the representatives of initiatives have experienced, on what moments they work together and what can be improved.

The methodological approach taken in this study is a mixed methodology based on semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The participants that are interviewed exist of representatives of local initiatives and representatives of municipalities, whereas the focus groups were set up with only the status holders. Although integration is a worldwide phenomenon, I chose to conduct data on the local level, in three municipalities in the Netherlands, because the initiatives work at the local level, the policies are executed at the local level and the status holders experience these policies at first at the local level. Next to this, it is interesting to compare these three municipalities to examine if comparable local contexts lead to similar results. These three municipalities are chosen with the help of the network of Justice and Peace, my internship organization, and corresponding characteristics of the municipalities. In the methodology section I elaborate on the way data is conducted within this study.

1.2 Background

To completely understand the research I do, it is important to outline some background information on the current refugee situation on the international, national and local level. That is why this section provides information on the current international debate, the Dutch policies on integration, the shift from a welfare state towards a participation state, and the focus of civic integration policies on the local level.

The current (international) debate on solidarity

In Europe, the managing and settling of refugees has been a challenge, not only because of the lack of facilities, money and time, but also because of the underlying political struggles. Some countries like Greece and Italy are the first point of arrival for refugees and therefore carry a heavy burden. Other countries, such as Hungary and Slovakia, try to reject refugees as much as possible (Eurostat, 2017). Many countries feared that they would have to accept more refugees than their country could cope with and that this would have major consequences for their welfare. A kind of 'not in my backyard' political game took place in 2015: the countries acknowledged that it was necessary to help refugees, but preferably not in their country. Furthermore, media outlets mainly showed negative news on the arrival of refugees and what negative consequences this so-called refugee crisis would have. These examples demonstrate that this crisis is not just one of refugees, but also one of solidarity. Countries opt for their own benefit and express little solidarity with the refugees or with other countries. Take for example Hungary, that closed its borders on refugees in 2015, and as a result not only refugees were no longer able to enter the country, but the refugees who were already there were locked up in so-called transit zones (Kallius, Monterescu and Rajaram, 2016; UNHCR, 2016). Komter (2004) explains that solidarity has changed over years and contemporary solidarity is influenced by many societal changes. Examples of these influences are the individualization of people and change in welfare states (on which I will elaborate later), the decline of religions, changing gender roles, and migration and globalization. "As a consequence of immigration new religious and political identities present themselves to the inhabitants of the Western world, giving rise to new questions and concerns about solidarity." (Komter, 2004, p. 169). Overall, it seems like solidarity has weakened. That is to say, at the international level.

On the local level however, a great deal of solidarity can be found. As CBS' research (2018a) identified, a large majority of the Dutch population is positive about taking in refugees who have had to leave their country as a result of war. In addition, there are hundreds of examples of citizens who have collected money or belongings for refugees, started volunteering at reception facilities for refugees, or tried to help them with other acts of solidarity and are still trying to do so. A simple search on the internet displays hundreds and thousands of initiatives throughout the Netherlands (SER, n.d.; VIDV, n.d.).

The question is whether there is a limit to the solidarity shown, and is this solidarity desirable? What does this local solidarity do for the status holders, their integration but also for the current policy in the Netherlands? And is this a sustainable way to help status holders or does it hardly add anything? These are important questions to keep in mind and questions on which I will elaborate at the end of this study.

Dutch policies on integration

To understand what roles these local solidarity initiatives play within Dutch society, it is important to understand what roles are formally taken by the municipalities and in what way they carry out the integration policies. Duyvendak, Pels and Rijkschroeff (2009, p. 5) explain the term integration policy as "a neutral sense to refer to the measures taken over the years by the government vis à vis (categories of) migrants and minorities residing in the Netherlands." Thus, to understand the integration policies in the Netherlands, we have to look into the measures that are taken in the last years concerning status holders.

At this moment, when a refugee becomes a status holder they are obligated to fulfil integration requirements. This includes the following parts: learning the Dutch language, knowledge of the Dutch society and orientation to the Dutch labour market. These requirements are tested by several exams that status holders all have to pass within three years (Klaver, 2017). In addition to this, the last cabinet implemented in November 2016 the *Bestuursakkoord Verhoogde Asielinstroom* (BVA) which was an agreement to implement, among other things, the *Participatieverklaring* (participation statement). This statement has to be signed by each status holder and its aim is to inform status holders on the core values of the Dutch culture (Rijksoverheid, 2015). In what way municipalities want to inform the status holders on the core values is upon themselves. Next to the participation statement, there have been changes on the interpretation and finances of the social support of status holders. Not only has the funding of the social support been raised, also more focus on the social support and practical help is asked from the municipalities. The goal of the BVA is to improve the collaboration between local and

national institutions and to improve the reception of the increased asylum influx (Rijksoverheid, 2015).

Since 2013, the providing role of the municipalities is reduced because more responsibility is placed on the status holder themselves by the implementation of *Wet Inburgering 2013* (Wi2013). This law means that the municipalities have to provide social support and housing to the status holders, but parts of the civic integration system such as language courses are not under their supervision anymore (Klaver, 2017). Before, the municipalities contracted and checked upon the educational institutes to make sure the status holders received qualitatively good courses and made progress in their civic integration process. As a consequence of the decentralisation of policies and the growing self-reliance of status holders, the municipalities have less control and overview on the civic integration process of the status holders (Klaver, 2017). It is the individual's responsibility, and the municipalities cannot intervene in the quality of chosen courses or progress of status holders. This is why municipalities want to obtain their coordinating role back, so they can retain the now missing quality control and overview.

Municipalities are free to offer additional help and courses to the status holders and in this way shape their own policies, but this also leads to differences between municipalities since they can offer different types of help of which the quality may differ. As Klaver (2017, p.6) explains "Some municipalities have implemented specific integration policies for these groups, others try to facilitate the integration of these groups with generic measures which are also available to other unemployed people." Van Heelsum (2017, p. 2143) also explains this difference: "Some cities' labour offices ask them to first obtain the language certificate before they give them support to find a job, but in other places, like Amsterdam, immediate working is stimulated and supported."

In conclusion, the national government decides on the admission and hosting of refugees. The municipalities are responsible for the civic integration process by offering information and guiding the status holders, but the status holder self is responsible for choosing and taking language courses, making sure to pass the integration exam within three years and signing the

participation agreement. And the municipality in which they start the civic integration process influences the extra help they receive.

The participation society

As Komter (2004) already pointed out, the individualization of people and change in policies influence solidarity. This is why the current change in society is important to discuss: the responsibility of integration that lies with the status holder is partly due to the current strong focus on self-reliance and participation of the government. Over the last four cabinets a shift has been made in the policies on integration in the Netherlands: the so-called Dutch Social Support Act (SSA) has been developed: "The goal of the Social Support Act is that everybody – old and young, handicapped and not handicapped, with or without problems – can join in social life. Everybody agrees that this is necessary. Many people can join without help but others need help and support, or a stimulating environment. Family, friends, social networks and organisations that citizens are a part of offer this help to a significant extent." (Tweede Kamer, 2003–04).

This SSA means that there is a shift of taking care of citizens and helping them where possible, towards shifting this responsibility to the citizens and trusting that society as a whole takes care of each other. The focus is on more active citizenship meaning more need for voluntary work, self-reliance and informal care (Verhoeven & Tonkens, 2013). This focus also becomes clear with the just discussed participation agreement, in which the government asks status holders to take their responsibility to actively participate in society. The government is trying to stimulate citizens to rely more on themselves and each other instead of on the welfare state.

Schillemans (2014) claims that the growing reliance on citizens is a general trend that he illustrates with coalition agreements from 1994 till 2012. These agreements show that for the past decades the government has tried to create a new understanding of its citizens, where the citizens are seen as solvers of their own problems. De Waal (2017) analyses this growing responsibility as well, specifically the responsibility of status holders to integrate in society.

She explains that integration is not seen as an achievement of a good functioning society anymore, but the achievement of an individual newcomer (2017, p. 17). That status holders first have to become the ideal citizens, before becoming a citizen at all (p.18). Schinkel (2007) has an interesting perspective on this active citizenship. He explains in his article the shift towards the participation society is a shift of formal citizenship of the state to a moral citizenship of society. Schinkel (2010, p. 266) explains what moral citizenship does to the meaning of citizenship: "Citizenship becomes a way of defining 'society' over against a realm discursively constructed as 'outside society', consisting of non-active or inactive citizens and non-citizens lacking proper 'integration' – which is termed as cultural adjustment through 'active citizenship'". Schinkel (2007) criticizes this moralising form of active citizenship and the way it excludes citizens from society, because it causes migrants and status holders to not be accepted in society, even when they have obtained citizenship.

This opinion of Schinkel shakes the understanding of citizenship and criticizes its meaning, and I feel this is important to emphasise within this study. Because who decides when someone is actively participating in society? Who decides when someone is fully integrated? As De Waal (2017) also points out, there are many different opinions on integration. Like the conservative-liberal political party, *Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie* (VVD), that acknowledges someone as integrated when they obtain a job (VVD, n.d.). But others would point out that speaking the Dutch language or having Dutch social contacts are the most important indicator of being integrated. There is no such thing as a list that can be checked off with integration requirements, except for the exams of the civic integration. And even if this list would exist, who would decide what jobs are good enough, what activities would present Dutch values and which status holders live up to these requirements? This brings along another issue which complements the criticism of Schinkel (2010): in the Netherlands status holders are judged on their participation in society, whereas Dutch citizens are not. A Dutch citizen could be unemployed, not doing any volunteer work and not speak with other Dutch people but still be seen as more of a citizen than a status holder who would do all these things. This concept of moral citizenship should be taken into account within this study because it points out the difficulty of judging integration and becoming a Dutch citizen.

<u>Local governance</u>

Next to a stronger focus on citizens' participation in society, there is also a shift of focus from the national to the local level. More often national policies are executed on and the responsibility of the local level. An example of this decentralisation is the just discussed SSA. Execution and responsibility of this SSA is now on the local level and only a framework to work with is given by the national government. Although the integration policies are established on the national level and mandatory for the local municipalities to imply, the way they do this and the additional effort and work they put into it may differ among them. This means that in this study differences may be found in the way local municipalities implement the national integration policies: the organization they choose to handle the social support, the advice on language courses and the additional policies they might (not) implement can differ.

De Wilde, Hurenkamp and Tonkens (2014) point out that with this shift from the national to the local, the responsibility also becomes one of local networks, local institutions and citizens. With the influx of refugees in 2015, many initiatives popped up to help them settle and guide them in the civic integration process. These local communities support status holders with their language courses, finding a job, social guidance, and more. Meaning not only the municipalities are active on the local level, but citizens take responsibility for the integration of status holders as well. But what De Wilde, Hurenkamp and Tonkens (2014) point out is that the risk can emerge that too many responsibilities are pushed down from the municipalities on communities. With the new law on civic integration of 2013 (Wi2013), the importance of acts of solidarity of local communities have increased. Due to the differences between municipalities in size, financial opportunities, number of status holders, etc., it depends on the municipality what it can offer to the status holders. When a municipality can offer less, more is depending on the status holders themselves, and with this the help of local communities is needed even more. Due to the shift to the local, the initiatives become more and more important in collaboration with the municipalities (Bolt, et al., 2017). They are the ones, together with the status holders and municipality, that take care of the integration process of status holders.

The described shift in policies and increased responsibility of the municipalities helps understand in what context this study is done. The focus of municipalities on self-reliance and participation of citizens cause the importance of local initiatives to grow. And the interpretation of the policies on integration by the municipalities affect the way they (do not) work together with or influence the local initiatives.

1.3 Relevance of the research

<u>Scientific relevance</u>

Over the past few years many studies on the hosting of refugees and the process of integration have been done. Much research has been done on which integration policies work best and how to improve the integration of refugees in society (Strang & Ager, 2010; Ager & Strang, 2008; Scholten & Van Nispen, 2015). However, because many studies are carried out from a national perspective due to policies on integration being made on the government-level, they lack the perspective of local municipalities and initiatives that contribute to the integration process as well (Ager & Strang, 2004). This study shows the added value of local communities to the integration process of status holders and builds in this way further on the local perspective of the integration process. There is little academic research on this local perspective and in what ways it can complement the national policies (Poppelaars & Scholten, 2008; Schiller & Çağlar, 2009). For example, we do not know much of bottom up initiatives of informal and formal institutions, or the challenges that municipalities face with implementing the policies and how initiatives complement these. Next to this, the research that is done on the local integration process often focusses on the influence of local municipalities and not that of local communities. We do not know, for example, what the added value of the local initiatives is to status holders next to the offered guidance of formal institutions, or what role they play in this process compared to the municipality. We do not know what niches in the policies local initiatives fill. This study seeks further explanation for these questions and adds to a more comprehensive definition of integration by focussing on the local communities involved in this process.

Next to this, this study adds to the debate on solidarity and social cohesion and how modern conditions like individualisation and globalization affect this solidarity. In addition, this study is not another example of the classical theories of social solidarity, where solidarity is studied as based on social relations and part of a community. Instead, this study highlights the perceived perspective of solidarity. That is, what does solidarity mean to the people receiving it, what does it mean to the society, and especially to the policies on integration in the Netherlands. In this way, a different perspective on solidarity is shown.

Moreover, the added value of local solidarity initiatives is a complex subject with many actors, such as the municipality, the status holders and other actors who contribute or counterwork this added value. That is why this study also tries to understand the role of the municipalities in association with the local initiatives and the perspective of the status holders. This adds onto the understanding of this complex subject. Although research by Denters, Tonkens, Verhoeven & Bakker (2013) describes how municipalities relate to civil society actors, and studies on the collaboration of municipalities with local initiatives have been done (Tonkens, 2009; Tonkens & Verhoeven, 2011; Verhoeven, 2010), they do not reveal how civil society actors, municipalities and status holders relate to each other.

Furthermore, this research adds to the literature on the effectiveness of integration policies. The current "refugee crisis" creates political, social and cultural changes in several countries and their societies, and this research can help overcome these challenges by providing new ways of managing the integration of refugees. For example, in the integration process there are many opportunities for national and local governments to work together with local communities, but knowledge on the methods are lacking in literature. This research aims to fill this literature gap by studying three municipalities in the Netherlands and compiling knowledge on these methods and the ways they work together. The results of this research can be used for further research on integration processes and local initiatives involved with refugee integration.

The empirical insights are specifically interesting for the Dutch government, since data of the three municipalities in the Netherlands can reflect on the flaws and successes of the current policies. Three municipalities are zoomed in upon and compared with each other, and reveal

differences regarding roles of municipalities, involvement of policy officers or use of collaboration networks.

The knowledge of this study can be used as a starting point for more research on local initiatives, in the Netherlands but also in other countries. The question on how to integrate status holders best in Dutch society is a question that I will not be able to answer, but this research may show how local initiatives are involved within this process and adds on to the field of literature that already exists.

Societal relevance

To have a society functioning at its best on an economic, political and social level, the integration of refugees is a critical issue. There are several debates on integration, on the local, national and international level. For example, the so-called *bed, bad, brood* discussion, where different parties in the Netherlands discussed the facilities that should be offered to (illegal) asylum seekers (NOS, 2018). Some citizens stated that facilities should be sober and not offer much, whereas other citizens think that those facilities are inhumane (NRC, 2015). Next to this, the current integration policies also received a lot of criticism. In July 2018, the Dutch minister of Social Affairs and Employment, minister Koolmees, presented his way of thinking for improvements of integration policies because "there are too many obstacles in the current system to make optimal use of civic integration as the start of participation in Dutch society." (Koolmees, 2018). On the international level, the distribution of refugees in Europe caused severe tension between several countries (NOS, 2015). These tensions relate to the settlement and integration of refugees, such as the violation of human rights or the refusing of refugees. Furthermore, on the local, national and international level, there are conflicting opinions on what is the best way to settle and integrate refugees. This research enlarges our understanding of integration processes, what actors can add to more solidarity within society and how local communities can help settle and integrate refugees in society.

Next to this, this research investigates the different actors involved in the integration process and in what way they help settle and integrate status holders. It helps understand integration processes from the perspective of local communities and non-state actors working on the local level. This study also adds to the understanding of municipalities on how to work with local communities and how to empower new non-state local initiatives. This research furthermore helps improve the local initiatives' effectiveness in the refugee integration process and helps prevent problems that occur if integration processes fail. This study discusses the network of the different initiatives and provides insights into how to improve their strategies and share experiences, practices and ideas with each other on the lives of status holders.

Furthermore, this study helps understanding the local solidarity that is expressed by citizens and raise awareness of this phenomenon. In this study the question is raised how sustainable the solidarity is, and if this solidarity can extinguish. And when solidarity extinguishes, what consequences this has for society and integration. With this information, I hope to inform and shake up the people that take the initiatives for granted and do not understand their added value.

At last, this study will help both the national government and municipalities to look critically at their own approach. This study provides insights into different ways of helping status holders and in this way also show the obstacles and opportunities they have to deal with. By looking at the ways local communities help status holders, more opportunities for status holders can be created and obstacles can be reduced. In this way, this study can help the process of finding the best way of integration. With more (comparative) research conducted, there will be more knowledge on the different ways of integration and thus also more information on the best way to integrate status holders. In this way, this research adds to more solidarity and harmony in society and more knowledge for citizens on status holders' settlement and integration. Also, governments can use this knowledge to improve their communication with citizens and choose their policies wisely, based on what works best for them.

Chapter 2. Theoretical framework

In the following chapter the main concepts of this research are explained, discussed and operationalized. This theoretical framework lays a foundation for this study, gives this research direction and helps understand the outcomes of this study. I choose to look into and understand the following three main concepts to answer my research question: integration, solidarity and civil society. Integration, because this research focusses on the integration process, and to understand this process it is important to look into the current academic debate on integration and state how integration is defined in this study. Solidarity, because the acts and initiatives of citizens can be seen as solidarity with the status holders. To understand what they mean, why people show solidarity and what they want to achieve with it, I operationalize solidarity. At last, civil society, because it enables me to examine who is involved in the integration process. Civil society is an actor that is not that often discussed within the literature on integration, but nevertheless can play an important role in the process. With this study, I examine what civil society focus on, in what ways they show acts of solidarity and how this affects the integration process of status holders.

2.1 Integration

To find answers to my research questions on the meaning and added value of local solidarity initiatives to the integration process, it is important that we understand the concept of integration. What dimensions are part of integration and in what fields do status holders integrate?

Over the past few years, not only researchers, but governments, media and society as a whole have struggled to find the best way to settle refugees and integrate them. Especially with the high influx of refugees in 2015, the urge to find answers to these questions are more pressing. Not only are there contrasting political opinions on this matter, also many conflicting definitions of the best way to settle refugees and definitions of integration exist in the literature. Robinson (1998, p. 188) describes the several definitions on integration as 'chaotic'. Although

there is a lot of literature on integration and integration is an important aspect that touches upon many in society, still there is not one comprehensive definition (Alencar, 2018). Castles, Korac, Vasta and Vertovec (2002, p. 12) state the same: "There is no single, generally accepted definition, theory or model of immigrant and refugee integration. The concept continues to be controversial and hotly debated". And not only the definition of integration is defined differently, but also the way integration is measured and the policies that are made upon integration differ greatly.

Throughout this 'chaotic' range of definitions, Ager & Strang (2008) help understanding integration by setting up a conceptual framework that identifies elements central to perceptions of what constitutes successful integration. They do this by defining four core dimensions of integration, starting with the foundation of rights and citizenship. They explain: "notions of nationhood, citizenship and rights will vary across settings, but in all cases such ideas are fundamental to understanding the principles and practice of integration in that situation" (2008, p.11). Ager & Strang (2008) further discuss how employment, housing, education and health function as markers and means of integration. Markers in a way that they mark whether the integration is successful in each of the fields, and means in a way that they support the achievement of integration. The connection between the foundational principles of integration and the markers and means in public outcomes is provided by social bridges, bonds and links. At last, there are the facilitators such as language and cultural knowledge, and safety and stability that form two areas that can counterwork or fasten the process of integration.

This concept of "successful integration" is very important to society, Schinkel (2007) argues. He explains that although it is not clear who's responsibility integration is, in general people find it important that everyone is integrated into society. He uses the term social hypochondria, which describes the collective fear to be ill or no longer 'whole', a social body that neurotically fears its health. Meaning that society finds it difficult if not everyone is part of society and integration is failing. Over the past few years this has become a moral construct where people are being labelled as inactive and not part of society when they are not integrated in society, even though they are legally allowed to live in the Netherlands. In this way citizenship is used as a way to decide who is and who is not included in society. Meaning that to society, one is

only integrated when next to attaining citizenship there is also full participation in society. These requirements are often only used to validate the citizenship of migrants, whereas the citizenships of people who are born here are not validated by their degree of participation.

In contrast to Ager & Strang, Penninx (2005) does not try to define successful integration, but defines different dimensions of integration. He describes integration as "the process of becoming an accepted part of society" (Penninx, 2005, p.141). This definition puts emphasize on the learning track and steps refugees take instead of looking at the final situation where the refugee is integrated. Next to this, it leaves open what society expects from the refugee and in what fields the integration should be fulfilled. It also leaves open who is responsible for this process: the national government, the municipalities, the local communities or the status holders themselves?

Penninx (2005) furthermore defines three dimensions of integration, namely the socio-economic, legal and socio-cultural integration. To support these different dimensions of integration, several diverse activities and initiatives take place. Socio-economic integration is mostly supported by offering language courses, educational trajectories, job placement, internships and internal learning environments, but also by making sure that refugees have access to basic needs (e.g. proper housing) so they can participate in the economic society. Most of the efforts within the socio-economic sphere focus on improving the labour participation of refugees. Furthermore, refugees can be supported in knowledge about their rights and obligations by legal advice and support in administrative trajectories. This is called the legal-political integration. Finally, the socio-cultural dimension of integration is supported by a variety of initiatives that help refugees, such as cultural exchanges, buddy support, religious support, participating in local social networks and sporting activities. These three dimensions correspond with the dimensions that The Council of Europe (1998) focusses on within integration. They can be looked at separately, but there is often a narrow line between the three of them.

Moreover, Penninx (2005) looks at integration policies on many different levels, such as the local, national and the European level. The municipalities cannot deviate from the national

policies, but are still the ones who execute them. That is why the emphasis of his research is on the local, since that is the level where policies are implemented and also directly felt by the refugees and the citizens.

In this study, I choose to focus on in what way local initiatives add to the integration of status holders on the local level. There are many initiatives, and since it does not fall within the scope of my research to explore all the initiatives, I focus on the ones showing solidarity in one of the three dimensions of Penninx. Most of my focus is on the social-cultural integration, since that is the dimension that most initiatives focus on: social activities, buddy systems and learning about the Dutch culture. Next to this, I use the definition of Penninx because it leaves open whose responsibility it is that status holders integrate into society.

Lastly, Favell (2003, p. 2) explains that there are many ways to describe integration, depending on who it comes from, what it focusses on and what field it is in. For example, the state more often focusses on integration as a policy and from a political perspective. But bottom-up initiatives in society could focus on the cultural and social aspects of integration. Next to this, there are many things connected to the concept of integration, such as policies on law and order, anti-discrimination law, immigrant and ethnic organizations, cultural practices, language courses, socioeconomic funds, etc. This makes defining integration a challenge.

This view is supported by Ager, Strang, O'May and Garner (2002). They stress the importance of the perspective that integration is described from and how this perspective affects the focus on integration dimensions. For example, there are the policy perspectives which focus more on citizenship, social inclusion and political participation whereas the refugees' perspective may focus on feeling at home, having access to basic needs and building a social network. Often, integration is described from the perspective of the receiving society, neglecting the perspective of other actors involved or even neglecting the perspective of the person who integrates. That is why in the next section, different perspectives on integration are discussed.

The various perspectives on integration

Next to the economic, cultural and political dimension and the different levels of place-taking, there is another important aspect to understanding integration, namely the agency of involved actors. The integration process is a never-ending process where many actors play a role and have expectations. In this section, I would like to address the agency of the status holders, the local municipality and civil society in this process because they have all different perspectives on integration.

Starting off with the perspective of the status holders themselves, the ones who are to integrate in society. This perspective provides insight on the challenges status holders have to overcome and how they manage their lives. This perspective also helps define the term added value in my research question, and describe what to them the added value in their integration process is. Although the dimensions of Penninx and indicators of integration like language, education, labour-market status and cultural/social adaption are often used in the scientific field of integration, this is a perspective of the receiving society. Through these definitions, the comparison is drawn between the status holders and the natives, and the requirements are set by the destination government.

Van Heelsum (2017) turns this perspective around, by focussing on the aspirations of refugees who arrived in the Netherlands in 2015-2016. She looks at the aspirations of migrants to obtain a satisfactory life with the help of Robeyns' list of fields of life (2007): health, food, income, education, justice, community activities and culture. I would like to zoom in on the community activities, defined as "community activities that make it possible to cope with the struggles of daily life and that foster real friendships and meaningful social structures" (Van Heelsum, 2017, p. 2138). Van Heelsum explains that the aspirations in this area are to make many Dutch friends, but without knowledge of English or Dutch this soon becomes a disillusion to the status holders. She explains "only a limited number of people seem to manage their aspiration of being part of a community that fosters real friendships and provides a meaningful social structure, and this might be a Syrian or Eritrean community. Obviously it takes a lot of time, some language proficiency, some luck and shared activities." (2017, p. 2147). Van Heelsum concludes her

study emphasizing the importance of knowledge of the Dutch language, having a job and becoming a part of a local community to the status holders; these three indicators helps them obtain their aspirations and have a satisfactory life on the long term. It is important to be aware of the aspirations of status holders and to look at integration from their perspective; they are individuals that make their own choices and although they are obligated to take several exams and follow certain courses, the action they take to integrate, the involvement, devotion and motivation is upon themselves. They have expectations of their own integration, as well as expectations of the help and facilities offered in the receiving country.

I use these last three indicators of Van Heelsum as pillars of integration in my own study to define the added value. Especially becoming part of a local community is important to this study, since local initiatives often focus on social activities in the community. In this study, the focus is on in what ways initiatives help with the integration process, what roles they take and how this might influence these three indicators. This study is not so much focussed on the end results or hard data, since it is difficult to measure the value of social interactions or buddy systems, and often initiatives do not measure the outcomes themselves.

The second perspective I would like to discuss is the perspective of the civil society; they have expectations of and opinions on the integration process as well. Tonkens (2015) explains that the interaction between citizens and state actors cannot be seen as a distribution of goals, tasks and responsibilities: this suggests that the actions and initiatives of citizens are irrational choices. This is not true, since emotions and the ideas of what a citizen's rights and duties are also intervene, meaning that civil society has its own rational ideas of integration. Spencer (2006) explains the importance of initiatives that stimulate integration that focus not only on migrants, but also on organizations that are in contact with migrants, such as civil society. Civil society addresses the importance of information provision to and consultation with local communities to make sure that they are prepared for the arrival of refugees, because these local communities are important as service providers and influence the integration process. Thus, civil society should be seen as actively involved in the integration process, with their own ideas and advices.

At last, as already explained in Chapter 1, the municipalities influence the integration process as well. The way they interpret national policies, the option to offer extra courses or services, their ideas and views on integration: all of this has its influence on the integration process of status holders. This is also part of the political idea they follow and how they define integration.

Overall, integration is not only defined in many different ways, but also by many different actors. Their perspective plays a role in the integration process with their own expectations and rational choices.

2.2 Solidarity

Another important concept within this research is solidarity. Since I look into the solidarity of local initiatives towards status holders, it is important to define what solidarity is and in what ways it can be expressed. As there are many studies and opinions on solidarity, it would be impossible to discuss them all in this literature overview. Therefore, I choose to discuss a few that help understand the concept of solidarity, the different concepts within solidarity and how to define it.

As with integration, solidarity has no general meaning that is accepted and used in the literature. The UN General Assembly (2005) identifies solidarity as a value that is fundamental and universal to the relations between people. The notion of solidarity that Durkheim (1964) developed in *Division of Labour* is one that is discussed much over the past decades. He divides this solidarity into two kinds of social solidarity: the mechanical and the organic solidarity. Mechanical solidarity is characterized by similarities, there is a collective belief and sentiment that is known by all the members of the group or community. Organic solidarity is more open to differences, it allows greater individuality. De Beer & Koster (2009, p. 15) describe a form of solidarity that touches upon the mechanical and organic solidarity: "the positive bond between the fates of different people". This definition focusses both on acts and attitudes, in different dimensions such as reciprocity, the organization, voluntariness, the scope and the form. In the following paragraph I look into these different dimensions.

De Beer & Koster (2009) start off in their book with explaining the differences between social solidarity, social cohesion and social capital. Where social cohesion and social capital refer to actual situations, solidarity is more normative and refers to feelings or attitudes: "solidarity means that the well-being of one person or of one group is positively related to the well-being of another person or group" (2009, p. 15). They furthermore explain the different dimensions of solidarity. Solidarity can operate in one or two directions, also named one-sided or two-sided solidarity. With one-sided solidarity, a person does not expect to receive the same as they contribute, whereas with two-side solidarity someone expects to benefit the same as they are contributing. This expectation does not mean that the expected is received, in general this is not equal. The second dimension is the organized or spontaneous act of solidarity; the formal versus the informal. Formal solidarity is the positive bond between people who might not know each other but are still formally connected. Informal solidarity is direct involvement and sympathy with other persons they know. The third dimension is if the act or behaviour of solidarity is expressed voluntary or compulsory. The compulsory solidarity is often forced by the state and does not give a choice whereas the voluntary solidarity is not done because they have to, but because they want to. The fourth dimension is the scope that the solidarity reaches, which can be local, national or global. On the local level often spontaneous (informal) acts of solidarity are expressed by families or neighbours whereas the global level is in general formally organized by governments. The last dimension is the form of the solidarity that is expressed: time, money or in kind. Many people think of giving money to charity when thinking of solidarity, but time is a more common form within the informal solidarity.

In the same vein, Komter (2004) describes in her book "Social Solidarity and the Gift" similar dimensions as De Beer & Koster, namely the reciprocity and social distance (formal or informal). But at the same time, she looks into the broad academical debate on solidarity, and adds two new dimensions with her model of solidarity. In this model (figure 1) there are four dimensions of solidarity differentiated, namely recognition of the other, social distance, motives and reciprocity. Recognition of the other is needed for the reciprocal exchange of solidarity. The social distance describes different groups, from closer ties as families to looser ties as the community. The motives are subdivided by affection equality, equality instrumentality and instrumentality power. Affection and instrumental solidarity come from the classical

sociological theory and are based on shared norms and values or self-interest and rational choice. Power equality, on the other hand, is a form of solidarity that focus on personal prestige and status of the giver, or humiliation and domination of the other. The last dimension, reciprocity, can be shown in the form of a gift or a sacrifice.

Recognition of the other	Social distance	Motives	Reciprocity	Solidarity
Recognition of the other	Family Friends Neighbors	Affection Equality	'Gift' concrete, personal	Solidarity
	Fellow citizens Strangers	Equality Instrumentality		
	Group Community Clan Nation	Instrumentality Power	'Sacrifice' abstract, anonymous	

Figure 1. Model of solidarity (Komter, 2004, p. 206)

Komter (2004) explains that the solidarity with fellow citizens and strangers is important, especially in a society where lots of different cultures come together and the social connectedness between those cultures creates harmony and mutual respect. This is specifically interesting in the context of this study, where different cultures come together by means of solidarity expressed by local communities. This community-focused definition is supported by Daskalaki & Kokkinidis (2017). They explain solidarity initiatives as bridge builders between different communities, that "gives rise to autonomous, non-hierarchical and affective spaces that strive to construct alternatives to the alienation and individuation incited by both neoliberalism and the indifference of state bureaucratic culture." (Daskalaki & Kokkinidis, 2017, p. 6). Rozakou (2016) explains that solidarity resembles something that society should be and how people should relate, constructed by moral ideals.

Another interesting aspect of solidarity to this study is explained by Einwohner, Kaire, Sinclair-Chapman, Subramanian, Tormos, Weldon & Wu (2016, p. 2) as active and passive solidarity: "Solidarity, or coordinated political action, can range from the passive (refusing to take action that would run counter to others' stated positions - for example, honouring a picket line) to active (engaging with others to jointly define political projects and purposes, through a deliberative process)." They furthermore explain that with active solidarity people try to achieve inclusion, creating ties between social groups, "active solidarity entails the active engagement of movement adherents in shaping a movement, its goals, and its strategy and tactics." (2016, p. 10).

At last, Dagger (1997, p. 26) defines in his book on civic virtues the concept of a special relationship "as the social tie between fellow citizens who are engaged in a special relationship and this connection encompasses feelings of loyalty towards and trust in fellow citizens as well as a sense of a common ground and the willingness to act with the common good in mind", which can also be seen as solidarity. He uses four components to define this relationship: integration, commitment to the common good, fair play and trust. Integration concerns a common understanding, an inclusive community and common identity, whereas the commitment to the common good focuses on serving public interest. Fair play is the aspect that concerns the reciprocal character of solidarity, that De Beer & Koster also described. And trust is needed to create a willingness to help, the trust hat citizens will not be taken advantage of.

In this study, I look into the different dimensions of solidarity expressed by initiatives that are active in the three municipalities. I especially focus on active, informal solidarity on the local level as explained by De Beer & Koster (2009). The formal state support is taken into account, and some informal solidarity may be initiated by formal organizations, but the main focus of this study is the voluntary, spontaneous solidarity of people and organizations and how this solidarity affects the common understanding of an inclusive community.

2.3 Civil society

The third concept that this research focusses on is the civil society. As with the previous named concepts integration and solidarity, there is no comprehensive definition of civil society that all researchers agree on. Sotiropoulos & Bourikos (2014, p. 35) explain what a civil society includes, namely a "vast array of professional associations and trade unions, charitable or religious associations, NGOs, non-profit organizations (such as public benefit foundations and think tanks), social movements, informal community groups and networks". Newton (2001) explains civil society as formal and informal social organizations which form a social network. Fukuyama (2001) explains that civil society functions as a protector of the state's power to individuals. As do Potter, Binns, Elliott and Smith (2008), they call civil society an agent of change. Edwards (2004) also points out the importance of the civil state as a protector but not to substitute for government. Gray, Bebbington & Collinson (2006) moreover suggest that civil society is diverse, and can vary in formality, size, geographic scope and connection towards others. This vast variety makes it difficult to come up with a definition that fits all the civil societies.

I choose to use a definition of civil society where volunteering, informal networks, NGOs, foundations, religious centres and knowledge centres are included. This definition leaves the local government out of focus and displays the informal local solidarity that is produced by civil society.

The relationship between the civil society actors and state actors is important to this study. That is why I shortly want to explain the different roles of the municipality within this relationship, as explained by Denters, et al. (2013). They suggest that the municipalities can have three different roles when it comes to solidarity initiatives initiated by civil society actors: stimulating, facilitating and coproduction. With the stimulating role the local initiatives are stimulated by the municipalities through invested money, coaching and activating citizens. By taking the facilitating role the municipality takes a less active role and is only involved by giving little help like knowledge, subsidy or attention, but especially giving space to the initiatives. This role is often taken when initiatives arise spontaneously bottom-up and ask for

the municipality to get involved, instead of the municipality involving the initiatives. The role is a more common role for state actors. The last role is the one of coproduction, where citizens and municipalities work together to create an initiative where both parties profit from. Here there is an equal cooperation and they become partners. This does not mean there is only one role that fits the way they handle citizen initiatives, they could also be switching between roles or combining them.

2.4 Operational definitions

At last, it is important to define a number of operational concepts on which this study focusses, namely status holders, the local community and civic integration policies. Especially since in literature these concepts are used and defined in many different ways.

When referring to people who migrate to the Netherlands, one can make a distinction between migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers.

Starting with the concept **migrant**. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2017) defines a migrant as "any person who lives temporarily or permanently in a country where he or she was not born, and has acquired some significant social ties to this country." Some state policies disagree with this definition and consider some people who were born in their nation migrants.

The Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights defines migrants as " (a) Persons who are outside the territory of the State of which there are nationals or citizens, are not subject to its legal protection and are in the territory of another State; (b) Persons who do not enjoy the general legal recognition of rights which is inherent in the granting by the host State of the status of refugee, naturalised person or of similar status; (c) Persons who do not enjoy either general legal protection of their fundamental rights by virtue of diplomatic agreements, visas or other agreements." (UN General Assembly, 2002)

In the UN Convention on the Status of Refugees of 1951 is the universally accepted definition of **refugees** contained, which defines a refugee as a person who, "owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it" (United Nations, 1951, p. 14).

Although this convention is universally accepted by 145 countries, the difference of becoming an **asylum seeker** still depends on the national government. This definition may vary between nations, so in some countries an asylum seeker is designated as a refugee whereas in other countries they are not, and their asylum is denied. Under EU law, asylum seekers are defined as "applicants for international protection" (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2014). So, not every asylum seeker is a refugee, but every refugee is an asylum seeker. In the Netherlands, refugees are granted a residence permit, which also brings along the tag **status holder**. In this study I refer to people who have fled their country and obtained a (temporary) residence permit to live in the Netherlands as status holders.

The last two concepts I would like to discuss vary greatly depending under which circumstances they are discussed. **The local community** for example, differs within every country and even within the municipalities as well. There is no formal definition to what extend it reaches: do we include streets, neighbourhoods, city parts, or districts? That is why in this research I define the local community as the people who within the municipality of the status holders are involved with the integration. This can, for example, be the city centre with a lot of activities going on, but also the municipality as a whole. Furthermore, it is important to stress that **civic integration policies** can also differ on a local level, although there is a national policy on integration. This is, as I explained in Chapter 1, because the municipalities are somewhat free in the choices of integration organization and the ways they spend their money on the integration help.

2.5 Conclusion: operationalizing the theoretical framework

I have discussed a broad range of theories and literature on integration, solidarity, migrants, and civil society, but to incorporate this knowledge in this research I will create a theoretical framework to use in this study.

As discussed above, integration is a complex term that has many definitions and contains several dimensions. To support the different dimensions of integration, several activities and initiatives take place (Penninx, 2005). The dimensions that I strongly focus on in this study, are the socio-cultural integration, and, to a lesser degree, the socio-economic and legal integration. This is because most initiatives in the chosen municipalities focus on cultural practices, contact between status holders and Dutch people, religious support, sports activities or building a network. There are also some initiatives that focus on language, such as language courses, language cafes and language buddies. This is part of the socio-economic integration. These, together with the initiatives that focus on internships, work opportunities and basic needs, contribute to the integration in the socio-economic dimension. At last, the interviews in this research with municipalities contribute to the legal integration since they provide knowledge on rights and obligations for the refugees. However, this is only a small part of this research. The main focus is on the socio-cultural integration.

Within the socio-cultural and socio-economic dimensions of integration the focus is on the three indicators of Van Heelsum (2017) that I discussed before: the knowledge of the Dutch language, having a job and becoming a part of a local community. In this way, the added value of local initiatives is operationalized. These three variables indicate what status holders find valuable when integrating into a new society. By using these indicators in the interviews, and looking into the several things that are offered by municipalities and initiatives, it is possible to make the added value tangible.

The several initiatives that are described above are activities of solidarity. Setting up a language café for people to come in contact with Dutch people and practice speaking Dutch without expecting any return is active, informal solidarity. Other activities consist of helping the status

holders (and other target groups, such as expats) that depend on the receiving society without expecting a reward or anything given in return. These activities are done spontaneous but also in formal ways, voluntary and obligatory, and are all on a local level. Most of the actors involved in the local solidarity initiatives provide activities or help in an informal way, on a voluntary basis. There are also formal actors such as municipalities or organizations that work commissioned by the municipality that provide obligatory solidarity. In this research the focus is on the informal local initiatives that provide voluntary acts of solidarity. Next to this, there are some interviews with the formal actors and the status holders themselves, to understand how they perceive the solidarity.

Interesting in this study is the balance between services that municipalities provide and services that civil society actors offer to status holders: what role do they take and who provides what? As discussed before, in the Netherlands there is a strong focus in the latest policies on participation of citizens in society, also known by the Dutch words *participatiesamenleving* and *doe-democratie.* Citizens should actively engage in society and take responsibility of their own lives. This is also applicable to the refugees that arrive in the Netherlands; they have to take own responsibility for integrating into society. At the same time, the integration requirements became stricter and more difficult to achieve (Algemene Rekenkamer, 2017). It seems that this is where the civil society actors emerge: to help the status holders where state actors cannot do this. The state actors focus on large groups, do not look at the individual problems of status holders where civil society actors have personal contact with status holders and see the personal problems they deal with. Next to this, the focus of state actors is more on the legal and social-economic integration, the so called *inburgering/*civic integration whereas civil society actors focus more often on the cultural and social integration of status holders. That is why this study conducts data with different actors, so that different roles within the integration process can be identified.

Overall, state actors and civil society actors seem to both influence the integration process of status holders. The way they do this, informal, formal and/or by integration policies, or in what dimension, socio-economic, legal and/or socio-cultural, may differ. With the help of these

theories I conducted data with several civil society actors, municipalities and the status holders themselves to see what role each actor takes within the integration process, if all actors influence the same integration dimensions and what value to the integration process this has.

Chapter 3. Methodology

In this chapter is explained in what ways research is conducted and how this data answers the sub-questions and the following research question:

What is the added value of local solidarity initiatives in Delft, Haarlem and Leiden to the integration processes of status holders?

First, I describe the research design and elaborate on my internship that initiated this research. Then I go into the way data was conducted by describing which actors were interviewed, how data was collected and in which ways the data was analysed. At last, I question the ethics of this study and try to indicate the methodological limitations.

3.1 Research design

This study focusses on three groups of respondents: three Dutch municipalities, the status holders that live in these municipalities, and the local initiatives started within these municipalities. With this focus I try to understand the roles that are taken by each actor and the added value they have in the integration process of the status holders. This is done from an interpretative philosophical approach, where the focus is on the experiences and understanding of the human being and the meaning they give to the world (Duberley, Johnson and Cassell, 2012). Prasad (2005, p. 13) explains this: "all interpretive traditions emerge from a scholarly position that takes human interpretation as the starting point for developing knowledge about the social world". Understanding these experiences of the respondents is done by a qualitative research, making use of semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Longhurst (2016) and Dunn (2005) explain that with a semi-structured interview, the interviewer asks questions to another person by following a list with questions the interviewer has prepared. The added value of semi-structured interviews is that the list of questions leaves space for exploring issues that might come up within the interviews. Furthermore, Longhurst (2016) explains the focus groups are a group of people that talk about a certain topic, in this case integration and local solidarity groups, in an informal setting.

This research is explorative since its goal is to provide knowledge on the roles and added value of initiatives in the integration process in municipalities that is no literature on yet. Furthermore, it aims to find out and understand how solidarity initiatives are included in the integration process and describe this. The intention is to present an overview of the three municipalities and explore the differences between them. Using only the three municipalities makes this study a case study: the focus is on a framed scientific problem within the municipality. Bassey (1999, p. 47) explains a case study as "a study of a singularity conducted in depth in natural settings". By choosing three municipalities within the Netherlands, this research can be explained as a multiple-case study.

Internship

During the writing of and conducting data for my thesis, I was a research intern at the organization Justice and Peace in The Hague. This organisation focuses on promoting human rights, solidarity and social justice all over the world. More specifically, in the Netherlands it focusses on the treatment and protection of refugees. I was involved with their *Welkom Hier* program in which they organize festivals to connect Dutch citizens with status holders. With these festivals they also try to connect the representatives of local solidarity initiatives with each other to strengthen the local solidarity with the integration of status holders in the municipality. The research my colleague Edith and I started was initiated by Justice and Peace to understand what impact the local initiatives have on the status holders, how their festivals help them connect with other initiatives and how they can possibly strengthen this network.

Due to the *Welkom Hier* festivals, Justice and Peace created a broad network with all the active initiatives in several municipalities, like The Hague, Rotterdam, Haarlem, Dordrecht, and more. This network was used to determine in which municipalities we would conduct data and do the research. Since Justice and Peace has organized the *Welkom Hier* festivals in several cities, we used the amount of active initiatives and warm contacts with these people by Justice and Peace to decide. This caused Haarlem, Leiden and Delft to be picked for the research, for different reasons. In Delft and Haarlem, a *Welkom Hier* festival was already organized, and Justice and Peace was curious what the current situation of the initiatives was and what they thought of the

impact of the festival. In Leiden, Justice and Peace saw an opportunity to organize the festival for the first time, but they wanted to be sure that people were enthusiastic about the festival. Next to this, we used further characteristics of the municipalities to decide the ones we would choose, which I will explain in a later section.

When the municipalities were chosen, I contacted the chosen interviewees by phone or mail, but always making sure to mention the person they knew from Justice and Peace. More often, it took a few days before a meeting was scheduled. The first interviews were done together with my colleague Edith in Haarlem, to make sure that we both understood the goal of the interviews, aimed at the same quality of interviews and used the same ways of interviewing. Afterwards, we split up and I did most of the interviews in Delft whereas Edith did most of the interviews in Leiden. When an interview was done, a report of the interview was made and sent to the interviewed person to make sure everything was understood well. At the end of each interview, we asked our interviewees if they knew any other important organizations or persons in the municipality who we could interview; through snowball sampling we could get in touch with more active people in the municipality.

In the municipalities, I spoke with many different organizations which I describe extensively in Chapter 4. In short, I spoke with representatives of initiatives with buddy programs, social activities, initiatives focussing on job opportunities, internships, initiatives focussing on learning the Dutch language, the Dutch culture and the ways around in their municipality. I also spoke with some core figures in the municipality, like representatives of churches, who were happy to give their opinion on the current situation in their municipality and share their experiences and ideas. Furthermore, I spoke with representatives of the municipalities who work with the integration policies, the initiatives that are active within their municipalities or with organizations that implement the policies on behalf of the municipality, like *Vluchtelingenwerk*. At last, I spoke with status holders that were known by the initiatives.

For Justice and Peace, we wrote a final report of this research with an overview of the active initiatives in the municipalities, the way they work together with status holders and the

representatives of the municipalities, and the help they offer in the integration process. Next to this, the challenges and successes of these initiatives are described. This report is published in June 2018 and sent to all the representatives of initiatives that were interviewed. Later, Justice and Peace will publish the report externally for partners of Justice and Peace and everyone interested. For Justice and Peace, this report is a valuable overview of what happens in each municipality and how they can respond to the activities that happen. For the people interviewed it may also help to see how they can strengthen their collaborations and overcome their challenges.

3.2 Research in the three municipalities

The used methodology in this study are semi-structured interviews and focus-groups. This data section can be divided in the following three stages: mapping the actors, data collecting and at last analysing the data.

The first stage: mapping of the actors

This stage involves the mapping of local state and non-state actors that help facilitate the integration of status holders in the three selected municipalities: Haarlem, Leiden and Delft.

Choosing the municipalities

As described before, the network of Justice and Peace was used to select the municipalities. Due to the network of Justice and Peace, contacts can be established faster and the interviewees are easier to gain trust with and open up in the interviews because they see Justice & Peace as a reliable organization. Some practical considerations in selecting the municipalities have played a role as well, such as how many people Justice and Peace know within the municipality and travel arrangements. While the network of Justice and Peace still left more municipalities to study than we could handle in the time given, we used characteristics of each municipality to finalize our selection. The choice has been made to include three municipalities which have a number of comparable characteristics, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that the chosen municipalities have approximately the same number of citizens, with the distribution of age also quite even to each other. Next to this, the number of status holders that the municipality was obligated to offer housing in 2016 and 2017 are relatively similar. This is of influence on the municipality because not each municipality can handle the same number of status holders coming to their municipality. For example, a much smaller municipality with a larger number of incoming status holders may lead to more problems, because the municipality might be unable to offer the facilities the status holders need.

What also could be of influence on the way municipalities handle the income of status holders is their political colour. The political parties are broadly similar in the municipalities, but still the differences between those parties are great. VVD, for example, is a right-wing party, whereas CDA is a Christian party and GroenLinks is a left-wing party. It is important to be aware of these differences and how this variation in the characteristics matter. On the other hand, the religious denomination and division of age under the inhabitants, which influence the policy on integration as well, are quite similar. With the similarities between the municipalities, it is interesting to look if comparable local contexts lead to similar results or not. But it is also important to be aware of differences between them.

Characteristics	**Haarlem**	**Leiden**	**Delft**
# inhabitants	159.229	123 661	101 381
Younger than 20	34 955 (22%)	23 965 (19%)	18 642 (18%)
Between 20 and 60 years	97 456 (61%)	81 923 (66%)	67 168 (66%)
65 years and older	26 818 (17%)	17 773 (14%)	15 571 (15%)

# obligatory status holders to offer housing 2016 & 2017	659 (0,41%)	551 (0,45%)	442 (0,44%)
Top 4 political parties	D66: 7 seats PvdA: 5 seats VVD: 5 seats GroenLinks: 5 seats	D66: 12 seats PvdA: 5 seats VVD: 5 seats SP: 5 seats	D66: 8 seats PvdA: 4 seats STIP (local): 4 seats GroenLinks: 4 seats
Political party mayor	CDA	PvdA	CDA
Involved in religious denomination, of which:	36,7%	37,2%	38,3%
– Roman Catholic	15,2%	13,5%	18,1%
– Islamic	7,6%	5,9%	4%

Table 1: Comparative data for selected municipalities (CBS, 2016; CBS, 2018b; Gemeenten van de Toekomst, 2018).

Choosing the local solidarity initiatives

For selecting the local solidarity initiatives, a sample is made of available initiatives within the selected municipalities. This sample is made by desk-research, knowledge of colleagues at Justice and Peace and through snowball sampling with the knowledge of interviewees, because there was no official overview available from within the municipalities. In selecting the initiatives, the aim has been to include at least one initiative in each of the different dimensions of the integration process, as described by Penninx in Chapter 2, in which they are active:

- legal-political: residence rights, citizen rights, acceptance as equal citizens
- socio-economic: full rights and opportunities of equal access in the hard fields of labour, education, housing and health;

- cultural/religious: rights and opportunities comparable to the established cultural and religious groups

There was not a minimum number of status holders that had to be helped by the initiative, as long as the initiative was in the local context, focused on one of the three types of integration that I chose to use in this study and would be willing to be interviewed. The leads to the overview at Table 2. An overall overview of these representatives can be found in Appendix I.

Type of integration	# of initiatives in Haarlem	# of initiatives in Leiden	# of initiatives in Delft
Socio-economic	1	1	5
Socio-cultural	6	3	7
Legal (political)	0	0	0

Table 2: Types of local initiatives per municipality included in the study (By author, 2018)

Representatives of the municipalities

To fully understand the policies of the municipalities, there are also interviews conducted with the policy makers within the local government. This interview focused on the experiences of the local government, their current policies and thoughts on and overview of the local initiatives that are around in the municipalities. I aimed at conducting interviews with persons that are closely involved with the policies on integration and/or the local solidarity initiatives. Often the names of these persons were found with the snowball technique: the initiatives or status holders helped. The overview of these representatives can be found in Appendix II.

The status holders

The experiences of the status holders are also included in this research, most importantly to present how they experience the role of the initiatives and what this contributes to their integration from their perspective. But also, to explain their perspective on the municipalities, the way they search and find the local initiatives and to describe their needs. These experiences are especially important to answer the sub-questions and understand what role the initiatives play in their lives. The interviews were originally done in Dutch, but when necessary switched to English. I tried to use basic Dutch sentences and let the status holder feel free to interrupt me if there was a misunderstanding. When a question was answered, I tried to summarize the answer to make sure I understood well. I tried to include a representative group of status holder with different backgrounds on the following criteria: country of origin, age, arrival in the municipality, social network and work experience. Table 3 shows the differences of the status holders.

Participant	Country of origin	Municipality	Age	Sex	# of years in NL	Work y/n
Participant #1	Syria	Leiden	33	Female	1.5	Yes
Participant #2	Syria	Leiden	26	Female	1.5	No (student)
Participant #3	Syria	Leiden	28	Male	2.5	Yes
Participant #4	Syria	Leiden	29	Male	2.5	No
Participant #5	Syria	Leiden	43	Female	2.5	No

Participant #6	Eritrea	Delft	20	Male	1.5	No (student)
Participant #7	Eritrea	Delft	45	Male	5	No
Participant #8	Eritrea	Delft	38	Male	3	Yes
Participant #9	Syria	Haarlem	29	Male	3.5	No (student)
Participant #10	Syria	Haarlem	41	Male	3	No
Participant #11	Syria	Haarlem	50	Male	2.5	No

Table 3. Characteristics of the status holders (By author, 2018)

Other state and non-state actors

To get a full understanding of the context and structures within the municipalities, also other stakeholders than local non-state initiatives are included in the study. These other stakeholders include:

- government implementation organizations working in the local context, such as *Participe*, the *JAS-program* or *Stichting Stunt*
- non-state implementation organizations such as Vluchtelingenwerk
- active volunteers that are very involved within the initiative network

The overview of these actors can be found in Appendix II.

The second stage: semi-structured interviews and focus groups (data collection)

In this stage, opinions and experiences are collected from the actors as described. This information is collected by means of semi-structured in-depth interviews with twenty-eight persons and three focus groups with eleven status holders. In this way a large range of persons can be reached, but at the same time the possibility of deepening the knowledge of a smaller number of people.

The idea of using interviews is to gain more information on the ways in which solidarity initiatives contribute to the status holders' integration processes, how they are perceived by different actors and what challenges the actors face in the local context. The planned duration of the interviews was one to one and a half hours, and all of them are conducted face to face and subsequently summarized. The interviews are based on common, semi-structured guidelines and are composed of questions related to different topics:

- Organization of integration processes within the municipality
- Organization, services and goal of local initiatives
- Cooperation between solidarity initiatives in the local context
- Practical experiences: successes and challenges

The questions can be found in Appendix III.

There is no reliable overview of the number of formal and informal organizations working on status holder integration within the municipalities available. Therefore, for this study, I included organizations, social networks, and groups that were known to Justice and Peace or were suggested by interviewees during the progress of the study. This was done by the snowball technique. To explore the diversity in services of local initiatives, an effort has been made to approach initiatives somewhat divided between the three main categories of integration: socio-economic, socio-cultural and legal types. Finally, to collect information from different viewpoints, the following respondents have been selected:

- Heads of office, coordinators and volunteers working on local initiatives
- Policy makers and policy implementers within the municipalities

- Policy officers, paid staff and volunteers of external implementation organizations:
- Status holders

The interviews are conducted with representatives of the local initiatives and the municipalities, whereas the focus groups took place with the status holders. Through the focus groups, several themes and subjects can be discussed, the status holders can respond to each other and more data is available. Next to this, the status holders are often occupied with language courses and work and in this way more respondents at the same time could share their experiences.

At the end, twenty-eight interviews were conducted and three focus groups took place (in each municipality one). I started off with the interviews in March, and tried to conduct two interviews at one day at maximum, because I gained a lot of information after one interview and it was hard to concentrate at more than two interviews. We started the interviews in Haarlem, then Delft and ending with Leiden, because the network of Justice and Peace was the strongest in Haarlem and thus the easiest and fastest to meet with respondents in Haarlem.

The interviews were set up in several places: sometimes at the interviewees home, other times at the organization itself and a few times in a coffee bar. As long as the interviewees would feel comfortable and the surroundings would not be too loud or distracting for the interview. When meeting people, I would ask them if they would feel comfortable being recorded during the interviews. If not, I would not record the interview but type down as much information as possible. This happened five times. Furthermore, I explained to the respondents that data would only be used anonymously for the report of Justice and Peace and my thesis would only be shared internally. Next to this, the respondents were free to stop the interview if they wanted to. When they agreed upon this, I would start the interview. In the beginning of each interview was described what the research was about, what its goals are, what Justice and Peace does, and why we approached the selected initiative or person. If the person did not ask for the questions beforehand, which we offered in the emails, I would describe what kind of questions would be asked in the interview.

The interview questions were set up with the help of my colleagues at Justice and Peace and divided in several themes, such as general information on the organization, challenges, experiences, and cooperation between parties. We set up three different lists of questions: one for the interviews with representatives of initiatives, one for interviews with the representatives of municipalities and one for interviews with the status holders. The questions for the representatives of the initiatives focus on the goals, activities and volunteers of the initiatives. It aimed to give more insights to the sub-questions: the meaning of their existence, their goals, but also their experiences, challenges and successes. And of course, we focussed on what in their eyes was the added value of their initiative and how they helped status holders. The list of questions for the representatives of the municipalities focus more on the current integration policies, their collaboration with the initiatives and what these active initiatives, in their opinion, add to the existing policies and way of working. There were also questions on the challenges they experienced with the new integration law of 2013 and how they dealt with the incoming refugees. At last, the question list for the focus groups with the status holders focussed on their needs, their experiences in the municipality, their thoughts on the several formal organizations, what the initiatives meant to them and how they have helped them. Especially with the status holders, it was important to ask the questions in a simple manner since not all of them were proficient in Dutch. We organized three focus groups, with five persons in Leiden and three persons each in Delft and Haarlem. This focus group was guided by means of the list of questions, but open to discussions between the status holders. Two of the three focus groups were not recorded, due to feelings of discomfort of the status holders.

All the questions were set up by focussing on the main concepts of the theoretical framework and through looking at the main and sub-questions. This method is explained by Boeije (2005) as sensitizing concepts: the literature was used to identify important theoretical concepts, these concepts guided through the data collecting process and at last were reflected upon when analysing the data. Through this method, the focus of the questions was on integration policies, the different kind of acts of solidarity, the added value, the bilateral character of integration, and so on. With our first interview, Edith and I experienced that some questions were formulated too difficult and there were too many questions for the time that was available. These shortcomings made us decide to shorten the list of questions, change the use of language

but we made sure we still got the information that we needed. Next to this, we made sure with the semi-structured interviews to leave time for new information and answers to questions we did not ask. We always ended the interview with the question if there was still something to be added to the interview. In this way, we made sure that the interviewed person would feel like everything that needed to be told could be.

In the end of May, each interview was conducted and all the focus groups took place, and thus all the data was conducted. We then started writing the final report for Justice and Peace.

The third stage: analysing the data

Since this study is to be a comparative case study, the third stage exists of analysing the data, comparing the information between the municipalities and drawing conclusions and recommendations upon this analysis. This is done by first preparing the data, coding it and then analysing it using Atlas.ti.

The data is recorded during twenty-three of the twenty-eight interviews and subsequently summarized. In each summary, the same themes are used to make sure that each summary includes the same topics and information. These themes were the headlines of the interviews, such as successes and challenges, or aims of the initiatives, but also themes that emerged during the interviews such as their view on the duration of the formal integration process. This summary transcript is then sent back to the participant to make sure everything was interpreted well. In some cases, the participant added some new information onto the summary, changed a few words or gave some more examples. In most cases the summaries were approved right away.

The summaries then functioned as the data and were categorized and coded in Atlas.ti. The data was coded by using axial codes: this "focuses on the analyst's attention along an axis, a theme of particular interest." (Cope and Kurtz, 2016, p. 653). The themes that were used are the themes that were also outlined in the questions of the interviews. In this way it was easy to identify

diverse information within the themes, compare them and analyse them to draw conclusions. I analysed all the data guided by the themes, categorize and coded them. In total there were fifteen codes used to analyse the data, of which 'challenges of the municipality', 'added value of the initiative' and 'collaboration between initiative and municipality' are examples. The list of codes can be found in Appendix IV.

These codes then helped me to structure the data, create an overview and find links between the several themes. The data coded with 'added value of the initiative', for example, showed me recurring examples of how initiatives helped status holders or what distinguishes them from the municipality. In this way, data was structured and analysed, and the final overview served as directive for my conclusion and helped me answer my research questions.

3.3 Ethics and limitations

Important to the quality of this research is to be aware of its limitations and ethical aspects. In this research there are a few limitations and ethical aspects that should be addressed.

First, it should be taken into account that status holders are a vulnerable group in society, thus with doing the interviews they should be treated as a vulnerable group. Some subjects might not be discussed if they are too sensitive. For example, one can imagine that it might be too sensitive to some status holders to discuss the family that they left behind or the traumas they had to endure. Furthermore, there is asked to each participant if the interview could be recorded, and no interview was recorded against someone's will.

Next to this, each research method used in this study has its limitations, because there is not one comprehensive method that summarizes all the information. For example, the in-depth interviews give a full image on some themes, but it might not be possible to generalize all these outcomes to the other actors. Generalizing the outcomes to other municipalities is difficult as well since each municipality differs on the number of inhabitants, number of status holders, religion, age, etc. but also on the amount of social initiatives and the way municipalities act

upon these. The municipalities that were used might be similar in some ways, but the differences with municipalities throughout the Netherlands are huge. For example, a municipality in the province Limburg, where the majority votes right-wing PVV, will probably not get the same results as the ones researched in this study. This makes it hard to generalize the data.

Another limitation of this research is the limited amount of people spoken to. Although there is a broad number of initiatives, status holders and municipalities representatives interviewed, I still cannot be sure that I spoke to all the representatives of initiatives active in the municipality, if the status holders are representative enough for the status holders that live in the municipality and if all the information was given by the municipalities. I tried to reach out to as many initiatives I could, but some were only active for a few months or years, and others did not want to participate in this study. This means that this study might not be complete and thus not represent the full activity in the municipality. Next to this, all the status holders I spoke with were brought to me with the help of the initiatives. In this way, the status holders do not represent the people that are not being helped by or active in initiatives in the municipalities.

At last, a limitation within this research is the researchers bias. I must be aware that while doing the interviews with many different people, I may have brought my own opinions, prejudices and background in the interview. Although I strived to be as objective as possible and conduct all the data in the same way, a small bias is hard to prevent. To act on this risk is a must, but it can still limit the research. This is why all results are discussed with my colleague at Justice and Peace and I worked with the same list of questions with each respondent to make sure that my bias could not affect the questions asked.

Chapter 4. Overview of the selected municipalities, their policies and the active initiatives

Since the outcomes of this study fairly differ per municipality, I will create more overview by first describing the activities of initiatives per municipality. Starting with Delft, then discussing Haarlem and ending this section with Leiden. Each municipality is described by means of the active actors that influence the integration process, which are the municipality, the persons working on initiatives and the status holders. Furthermore, I describe the mutual relationships of these actors and what effect these relations have on their actions. This is general information that I conducted during my interviews in the municipalities, and this information is needed to understand what each municipality organizes in terms of status holder integration and how these activities lead to the results in Chapter 5. After this chapter, we further dive into the status holder integration, and I will describe and compare the results to my research questions of the three municipalities and outline their differences, but also look at the similarities that I came across.

4.1 Delft

The municipality

The municipality of Delft does not run a separate program for the integration of status holders in its municipality, but has opted to bring all related developments together with a coordinating policy officer. Next to this, they set up a few formal organizations that are responsible for the guidance of the status holders in Delft (Interview 8, April 4, 2018). Participe is the main organization that is responsible for the social guidance of the status holders by providing the basic facilities from the beginning on. Status holders are being helped with signing the contract for their new house, receiving social welfare benefits, finding their children appropriate schools, arranging things within the municipality, and so on. Participe offers social guidance from the moment a refugee gets its status till six months from then. During this study, Participe has guided 77 status holders in the past half year (Interview 10, March 26, 2018).

In those six months the status holders also follow a language course at one of the certified language schools in Delft. Because there is a variety of schools in Delft, the municipality set

up another formal organization to help status holders find the right language school for them. This organization, Taalhuis DOK, provides information on several language schools and helps status holders with making the right choice. Furthermore, the municipality works together with Werkse! and Stichting Stunt to find fitting jobs. Werkse! helps the status holder that is ready for work to find a job and to overcome obstacles. When Participe notices that a status holder has a difficult time participating in the job market, they refer them to Stichting Stunt to make sure the right steps are taken to grow. After these six months of guidance by the formal organizations, status holders should be able to stand on their own two feet and be self-reliant. If Participe believes this time not sufficient, the six months can be expanded with an additional three months of guidance. For status holders under 27 years there is a special program, the *Jongerenacademie*. This program focusses more on civic integration, study and internships. Since 2015, the Jongerenacademie has guided 235 status holders (Gemeente Delft, 2018).

The initiatives

What I noticed in Delft is that there is one initiative, namely DelftseBuur, that is the driving force by reaching more than 250 status holders with hundreds of volunteers. Next to this, there are many smaller initiatives that are less visible and sometimes rely on this bigger initiative. The representatives of initiatives I spoke with are similar in a way that they all focus on the integration process of the status holders.

Language

There are initiatives as DelftseBuur, Taalleren and Engineers for Refugees that help status holders with practicing their language skills. Engineers for Refugees does this by providing certified Dutch courses where status holders practice four days a week for four hours and do their homework at the Delft University of Technology. After this program they are able to pass the civic integration exam and know the Dutch language at level B2 (Interview 11, March 29, 2018). Taalleren offers language courses to status holders as well, and next to this organizes language cafes where status holders can practice their Dutch with citizens from Delft. DelftseBuur is an organization that provides weekly events where status holders can come

together with residents from Delft to practice their Dutch and ask questions. Taalhuis DOK, the formal organization of the municipality, also offers language buddies to the status holders that come along. A volunteer can help the status holders by practicing Dutch and focussing on language.

Buddy systems

Next to the Dutch courses, DelftseBuur and Engineers for Refugees also offer social buddies to the participants. Hundreds of people have volunteered to become buddy of a status holder and welcome them in Delft. With these social activities the status holders get to know the Dutch culture, build a social network and always have a person nearby that can help them with their questions (Interview 1, March 29, 2018).

Others

DelftMama is an organization that helps refugee families to get prepared for their new born, get supported in this process and feel at home in their new city. They do this by helping them find the right furniture and baby gear for their new houses. This is one of the initiatives that I came across that was quite different than any other, because it focussed on a very specific group and offered different help than any other initiative. Another way of helping the status holders is the financial support of the churches in Delft. When there is a person or group of status holders that need financial support, the churches may offer to support them financially (Interview 2 and 5). Then there's School's Cool, a mentor organization that guides young status holders with their school matters. This is not only practicing Dutch and doing homework, but also helping with their schedule, making an overview of courses, finding out why someone failed a test, and overcoming other obstacles.

All the initiatives named above are trying to help achieving the following goal: welcome the refugees in Delft, make them feel at home and try to support them with their integration process.

The status holders

The status holders I spoke with in Delft during the focus group were three persons that were actively part of the community of DelftseBuur. They all value the initiatives that are active in Delft. It creates space for them to ask questions that cannot or will not be answered by the municipality, and the initiatives can offer sustainable, social contacts. Next to this, the initiatives help them learn their way in the municipality and the norms and values of the Dutch culture.

Notable here is that although the opinions on initiatives are very positive, the opinions on the role of the municipality differ. Some of the status holders are very positive and seem to be helped a lot by the municipality, whereas others explain that they're not being helped enough and still have many questions. It seems like the status holder who is more self-reliant and the status holder that is being helped by the *Jongerenacademie* are better off and are more positive about the municipality because they do not need as much help as the other status holder. The other status holder explains that communication is difficult, quality of language schools is bad, and bureaucracy is counter working the integration process.

The collaboration between the actors

Welkom In Delft is a collaboration platform that exists of informal organizations, like DelftseBuur, Engineers for Refugees and representatives of churches, but also formal organizations like Participe. It is established by Participe to coordinate and connect all the different initiatives that welcome the refugees that come to Delft and make sure there is an exchange of information on status holders between the organizations. The intention is for them to meet every six weeks, but experience shows that it is often more irregular (Interview 8, April 4, 2018). Due to this irregularity and reduced preparation of Participe, some representatives of initiatives also dropped out or are not active as much anymore in the platform. During the last meeting there were tensions between the formal and informal organizations because of the little coherence in approach of the status holders: the informal organizations believe that the six-month guidance of status holders is too short and felt like these signals were not seen by the formal organizations (Interview 1, 2, 5, 8 and 10).

Many representatives of initiatives believe that some status holders are threatened with falling by the wayside after their first six months of social integration because they are not taking care of anymore. In the half year of social guidance, a status holder receives partly too much information to process, because there are so many things that have to be dealt with in the integration process, and partly too little, because not all-important events for an "ordinary" citizen have already come along and been explained (Interview 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). For example, a status holder can be finished with the six months of guidance but still receive letters of the municipality or DUO that are too difficult to understand.

The representatives of initiatives also believe that the municipality stimulates the initiatives, but at the same time shifts many tasks to the initiatives instead of to professionals. This creates a bigger workload for the initiatives and often they do not feel like they should be the ones that are responsible for those tasks. Furthermore, some representatives of initiatives have indicated that they experience that the municipality is not aware of the needs of status holders and does not pick up the signals from the initiatives. When they signal the municipality on important matters or striking problems they have come across, there is not always acted upon by the municipality.

4.2 Haarlem

The municipality

There is since 2016 the *Sociaal Programma Statushouders* in Haarlem, an integral program which focusses on the integration and participation of status holders. The goal of this program is to improve the integration process by a stronger focus on housing, education, work and other factors of integration. They try to facilitate as much as possible the connection with regular services and agencies for the status holders. Examples of these are an introduction program, improving information facilities and improving the collaboration between organizations. To do this, Haarlem set up a steering committee, consisting of municipal officials and representatives of important social initiatives, and an advisory committee, consisting of twenty status holders that can give their input on policies. This integral program is partly executed by

Vluchtelingenwerk, the organization that is responsible for the guidance of the status holders in Haarlem for the basic facilities for one year (Interview 28, April 6, 2018).

The initiatives

In Haarlem, the general involvement of citizens with status holders is great: there are many initiatives of citizens and informal organizations that focus on assisting and supporting status holders. Within these initiatives, a distinction can be made between the 'newcomers' (refugees who have come to the Netherlands in large numbers since 2015) and 'oldcomers' (status holders who have lived in the Netherlands for some time) as target group.

In Haarlem, I found that social initiatives are active for status holders in the following ways:

- Guiding status holders to the labour market through mentors from the business community
- Language buddies
- General buddies, with whom status holders can do social activities and at the same time practice the Dutch language
- Supply of food aid during the period that status holders do not yet receive a financial allowance (this took place in particular in 2015, when large groups of refugees arrived in Haarlem)
- Organize sports activities and make status holders familiar with sports clubs
- Organizing meeting places such as women's cafes, youth cafes, a summer school and children's activities
- Joint cooking projects (Eat & Meet) and restaurants cooked by status holders
- Social enterprises in which status holders are trained and able to work
- Knowledge cafes where information is provided for status holders and volunteers
- Collection actions
- And more

The community of social and civic initiatives in Haarlem comes across as being close; in all interviews in Haarlem it came forward that the representatives of initiatives know each other,

cooperate on a regularly basis with each other and, when needed, refer to each other (Interview 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, and 27). They meet during coordination meetings with the municipality or local welfare organizations and form an informal but active network. A small group of social initiatives is part of the steering committee for the social program of the municipality of Haarlem.

The status holders

In Haarlem I spoke with three status holders, who I was referred to through one of the initiatives (snowball-sampling). They've lived in Haarlem now for 2 till 3.5 years and were helped a lot by the active initiatives. Especially in the beginning when not many initiatives were active, *Stem in de Stad* and the churches in Haarlem were extremely helpful by providing food for them and making sure they were helped with the needs they had.

The status holders in Haarlem spoke of the same challenges as the ones in Delft: bureaucracy and communication problems such as feeling judged by Dutch people. An example of this judgement is that some prejudice may occur on both sides of the buddy system. A status holder in Haarlem felt judged by the question of a Dutch buddy why he had such a big TV in his house and why he was not riding a bike instead of buying a car. Another problem, one status holder explains, is that initiatives might not see people falling behind. This happened when the initiatives focussed on the large group of refugees in De Koepel in 2015 but paid less attention to the refugees that were already in Haarlem and just moved out of the AZC's.

The collaboration between the actors

From the interviews, a positive image of the cooperation between the municipality of Haarlem and the social and civic initiatives came forward. Although several local parties are active in various areas (formal and informal language providers, buddy projects, sports activities) they are not trying to compete with each other, although there is occasional overlap in service provision. Networks and activities are coordinated in various network consultations, such as the 'basic skills network' (including language), the Social Program steering committee and

work-related networks. Some parties with language buddies work together by aligning which training sessions are given to volunteers and inviting each other's volunteers. In this way, sufficient guidance can still be offered with the modest available budgets.

The interviews revealed that the relevant contact persons from the municipality, but also important municipal key figures such as the mayor and some aldermen, are experienced as very involved and open to cooperation with formal and informal parties in the local environment (Interview, 18, 19, 20 and 24). There are short communication lines between the parties involved and the core group of social initiatives is directly involved in the design and implementation of the program. Around this core group is a somewhat looser "peel" of initiatives, such as organizations and citizens' initiatives, which - logically - experience more distance.

Nonetheless, the representatives of more distanced initiatives we have spoken to also experience that the municipality is willing to facilitate their initiative. This might be because of the existence of a number of regular entrances to the municipality for initiators who want to be supported, such as a budget for 'rapid interventions' (subsidy up to EUR 2,000) and innovation budget (Interview 28, April 6, 2018). One of the representatives of initiatives described the initiatives in Haarlem as a "table": "one joins more easily than the other, but the core group is always there" (Interview 20, March 27, 2018). Another interviewed person compares the local dynamics in Haarlem as "an archipelago of islands with many ferries sailing back and forth and here and there a bridge between two islands. The 'map' is clear: everyone knows each other, while everyone thinks that their own work is the most important, but they know how to find each other." (Interview 24, March 20, 2018).

Nonetheless, all parties indicate that an overview of and control over the various initiatives is necessary and that cooperation and coordination can be streamlined on many fronts. One of the representatives of initiatives in the field of sport described it at the beginning of this year as "a big spaghetti of different parties that all have a role" (Interview 23, March 23, 2018). In addition, a number of initiatives indicated that there is room for more efficient coordination

because they often meet in different networks and from different roles. Overview of all the different local initiatives also ensures that volunteers know well where they can refer their buddies to.

4.3 Leiden

The municipality

Since the start of 2016, the municipality of Leiden has set up a separate project for the integration of status holders: the JAS project. This project arose from the municipal's responsibility of the participation statement and is aimed at activating status holders and guiding them towards work or training. In addition, the project also pays attention to the physical and social well-being of the status holder, who are also guided in getting to know the city. The project requires intensive deployment of status holders: 24 hours a week. The project receives funding from the ESF (European Social Fund) to describe and share the development methodology of JAS (Interview 12, April 25, 2018).

Before status holders start with the JAS-program, they are guided by Vluchtelingenwerk for a year. This differs slightly from the program of Vluchtelingenwerk in Haarlem, but focusses on social and juridical guidance and housing of status holders as well. Every status holder gets one contact person within Vluchtelingenwerk that can be approached for questions and advise.

The initiatives

Leiden is described by the interviewees as a warm and inclusive city (Interview 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17). There are various social and civic initiatives that offer different services:

- Language buddies, language groups and language cafes
- Professionalize and help organize citizens' ideas for integration projects
- Organize joint meals with status holders and Dutch citizens
- Incidental organization of projects from an artists' collective
- Mediating towards voluntary work between status holders and organizations

- Providing relevant information about status holders to organizations with the aim of removing fears
- Legal and social guidance
- And more

The image that emerged from the interviews in Leiden is that there is a great involvement of citizens in the city. A number of initiatives know each other and sometimes work together, but that is partly dependent on personal relationships.

The status holders

In Leiden, I spoke with five status holders of whom one person lived in Delft but was more often in Leiden because of her language course. Again here, the status holders confirmed the image that was described in Haarlem and Delft as well: the local initiatives are a positive influence in their lives. With the help of local initiatives, they were able to make various social contacts, learn about the Dutch culture and not feel isolated and alone anymore. They were able to ask the questions they have and solve their problems with the help of initiatives. One status holder did not feel the need to become active with an initiative but liked the thought of being able to when he would need it.

They do say that the initiatives and municipality would benefit from more communication and collaboration, because at this moment there is no clear overview of all the different organizations, and the status holders find it difficult to find the information they need. You could say there is an overload on information providers.

The collaboration between the actors

In the past, the municipality of Leiden has organized a consultation table (the Refugee Table) a number of times, in which involved officials (including the JAS project) consulted with representatives of local initiatives. This consultation table caused diverse opinions; some felt like they could not be critical as representatives of the JAS project overruled the meetings, others felt like it was a good way to stay in touch with the municipality (Interview 13 and 15).

Other ways of contact between municipality and initiatives are the financing of initiatives, such as the kick off of We Are Leiden. More structural support from the municipality would be appreciated by the initiatives, so they do not have to make a new application for each project (Interview 13 and 17). This cooperation could also be strengthened in other dimensions of help, now it is mainly financial resources.

The initiatives would be helped with a person or institution that would bundle all the existing initiatives, coordinate collaborations and creates overview. We Are Leiden (Interview 17), for example, has the overview of many initiatives, but is also often surprised by unknown initiatives. Initiatives indicate that they do not have time or money to take that directing role, but suggest that the municipality might. At this moment, a lot of initiatives are active and involved with status holders but not that many initiatives work together to strengthen their impact. A lot of them are focussing on their own projects and goals, and only when necessary they work together.

Chapter 5. Results - Experiences of the initiatives and their added value

As became clear from Chapter 4, the municipalities have a different approach in executing the policies on integration and different activities take place within the municipalities. These differences, but also the similarities and other striking features I came across during my research are discussed in this chapter. These findings help me describe the answers to the main and sub question of this study and are answered in Chapter 6. After all, my research questions focus on the added value of local solidarity initiatives, the meaning of these initiatives, their goals, their experiences, challenges and successes with the integration process. At first, this chapter focusses on the sub-questions by describing the experiences of representatives of local initiatives and the municipalities, then this chapter answers the main question by looking at the added value of local solidarity initiatives.

5.1 Experiences of the initiatives

<u>Cooperation between local initiatives and municipalities</u>

As discussed in Chapter 2, the relationship between civil society actors and state actors is important to make the initiatives function at their best. The municipalities can have three different roles, namely stimulating, facilitating and coproduction (Denters, et al., 2013), that form the cooperation between them and the civil society actors. The municipality has a number of formal tasks and responsibilities in the integration of status holders, such as providing housing, schools for pupils, social counselling and the participation statement. On a number of other fronts, such as offering language lessons for the civic integration programme, municipalities have lost their responsibility since the implementation of the Wi2013, the civic integration law, which led to the necessary challenges.

The studied municipalities realise that they can make good use of the help of social and civic initiatives in the integration process of newcomers to the municipality, and therefore sympathize these initiatives. However, a municipality often has to deal with a multitude of local initiatives, which do not always work with the same goals and starting positions. In practice,

municipalities have found different ways to cooperate with social and civic initiatives, and this cooperation has an impact on the results of these initiatives. The important question is: to what extent is control exercised over the various initiatives and who is responsible for their implementation?

Since 2016, the municipality of Haarlem has a Social Programme for status holders, which has an integral character and focuses primarily on the integration and participation of status holders. The programme is set up in such a way that the municipality works together with a steering committee, consisting of municipal officials and representatives of the most important social organisations in the field, and an advisory committee, consisting of approximately twenty status holders who think along with municipal policy, implementation and results. As a result, the lines of communication between the parties involved are short and the core group of societal initiatives is directly involved in the design and implementation of the Social Programme (Interview 28, April 6, 2018).

All the municipalities I studied maintain a form of regular consultation with social and civic initiatives. The representative of the municipality of Haarlem emphasizes the importance of this consultation: "We really do this together, the strength of the city" (Interview 28, April 6, 2018). But consultation alone does not necessarily lead to effective cooperation and clear direction. What local initiatives need is largely determined by the attitude of the municipality: that a municipality gives appreciation and confidence to local initiatives, is willing to join bottom-up initiatives, gives space and support to local initiatives to develop their activities, and is willing to listen to signals from these initiatives. Mayors, aldermen and civil servants involved can play a key role in this. Meaning that the stimulating role, as described by Denters, et al. (2013), is important, yet not seen in each municipality. Often the municipalities balanced between the role of facilitating and stimulating, where municipalities are involved and try to appreciate and stimulate the initiatives as much as possible, but money and time could limit this.

> In 2016, a small group of volunteers found out that the summer period for a group of Eritrean youths living in a group location in Haarlem was not a good time; there were no language lessons in the summer and no other activities were organised. The group of young people got bored and there was a risk of slipping social behaviour. The volunteers then rang the bell at the municipality. Thanks to the trust that had been built up between the volunteers and the municipality, they received a budget from the councillor in charge within no time, with which they could organize a summer school with activities themselves (Interview 24, March 20, 2018)

Although the three roles of Denters, et al. (2013) are thorough defined and parts of the roles are found in this study, it is not fully comprehensive. This study shows that a governing role is missing in their theory. A certain degree of control seems necessary because a large number of different parties are involved in the integration process of status holders, who often have their own views on integration. Within organisations, status holders often have to deal with more than one department. This fragmented service makes it difficult for the status holders as well as the employees and volunteers involved to understand the situation, and as a result it is not possible to achieve the maximum results on all fronts.

It is most obvious to ascribe the governing role on all parties involved in the integration of status holders to the municipality, because building and maintaining a network takes a lot of time and is often not feasible for small, informal initiatives. It is also recommended that efforts are made to increase the self-governance of status holders by creating a place where information is available about various forms of service provision, so that those who are able to do so can make their own choices about what they need.

Mutual cooperation between initiatives

The way in which initiatives cooperate or not with each other varies greatly from one municipality to another. Cooperation between local initiatives is often not structurally

organised. Where municipalities organise coordination meetings, cooperation does take place, but structural mutual consultation without the intervention of the municipality does not often take place. Nevertheless, local initiatives do find each other regularly and work together to a greater or lesser extent, also in order to reach the various group of status holders in the city more effectively.

Sometimes cooperation takes place on the basis of participation in local themed networks (such as networks aiming at job placement or at strengthening basic skills), sometimes based on existing personal relationships between people. Some parties that are active in the same field, such as language skills, work together by coordinating the training given to volunteers and invite each other's volunteers to join them. In this way, with the modest budgets available, a variety of support can still be offered to volunteers.

In general, it can be said that there is room for improvement in terms of creating an overview of the parties, managing the cooperation and streamlining the coordination. This makes it possible to make better use of the various strengths of the initiatives, to avoid potential competition between parties (e.g. recruitment of volunteers), to avoid duplication in service provision and to avoid placing the greatest workload on one party. For example, DelftseBuur is seen as a 'go-getter'. From the beginning, when the status holders arrived in Delft in 2015, they took the initiative in setting up help. They started by coordinating volunteers, matching buddies and focusing on requests for help from status holders. As a result, they have become a party in Delft to which other parties refer a great deal and thus they experience a great work pressure. As De Wilde, Hurenkamp & Tonkens (2014) already explained, this is one of the risks that can emerge in the cooperation with local initiatives: too many responsibilities are pushed down on them.

Not only from the perspective of the municipality, but also from the perspective of the local initiatives, some degree of direction and coordination is therefore highly desirable.

<u>Reaching and keeping an eye on the target group</u>

It is a challenge for municipalities as well as for social initiatives to reach all status holders, and representatives of the initiatives are concerned about the status holders that are not reached at all. The organisations that offer social guidance on behalf of municipalities are to reach all status holders in the municipality, although this cannot be made a hundred percent conclusive. In some cases, social assistance is provided by means of walk-in consultation hours, as a result of which status holders themselves have to take the initiative to come. Access to status holders may also vary from country of origin: practice shows that it is easier to get in touch with people from the Syrian community than with people from the Eritrean community.

An initiative that offers (i.e.) language support realizes that they only reach people who have already been assertive enough to visit a library or to join a language group. For this reason, they are actively investing in increasing their visibility in places where status holders (or others of their target groups) have to go for formalities anyway (Interview 18, March 8, 2018).

Finally, it is difficult for municipalities and organisations to keep a close eye on the target group in the long term. The social support provided by the municipality stops after a certain period (maximum two years, shortest six months). Next to this, status holders who have found paid employment and who therefore disappear from the benefit system are no longer included in this guidance. From that moment on they have to make use of the regular services, but in practice it turns out that this is not sufficient for every status holder. Vluchtelingenwerk Leiden explains:

"Adapting to the new environment needs more time in most cases, not only because they do not speak the language well yet, but also because they are lagging behind in other areas, such as finding your way around the administrative mill, understanding how digitisation works" (Interview 14, April 16, 2018).

A representative of an initiative in Delft agrees with this:

> "We have been on the road for a couple of years now. We soon realised that half a year of refugee counselling was far too short. Whatever they say, you're helping people and helping them a second time at the same point cannot be done anymore: they're gone already. And if people have been away since December and in January the tax assessment will come in, they will have no one to help." (Interview 1, March 29, 2018).

The municipalities and health and welfare organisations are doing their best to embed this target group as well as possible in their regular services, but have to deal with their own pace of development. Although there are no ready-made answers to this problem, social and civic initiatives do hold the key to this: thanks to their large network within the group of status holders and the trust ties they have built up, they are in a better position than any other formal body to keep an eye on the welfare of status holders who are in the picture with them or with their mutual networks.

Equality

The needs of the status holders lie partly in the area of social contacts: conversation, encounters, building a new network, learning to speak Dutch, going out and no longer being alone, discovering their new city and the Dutch culture. This picture emerges from the interviews with representatives of initiatives and has been confirmed by the focus groups with status holders. An important note that was made in this respect was that the social interaction must be done on the basis of equality. A status holder from Leiden explains this: "Refugees and the Dutch need a bridge in order to understand each other properly. The bridge has to come from two sides."

Various initiatives have shown that this is not always self-evident, regardless of all the good intentions of volunteers and concerned citizens. Several status holders and initiatives have experienced that while many people are interested in the flight stories of status holders, there is

less enthusiasm to actually invest in status holders. In addition, the risk of 'assistance' by volunteers is prominently present. Refugees are often associated with problems and some of the citizens involved are keen to help solve them. An initiative in Leiden that works a lot with volunteers indicates that some volunteers find it difficult to let go and therefore solve a lot of problems for a status holder; this does not teach them to become independent (Interview 17, April 17, 2018).

Real connection on the basis of equality is therefore not always easy to achieve, but it is essential for the social integration process. Some status holders indicate that they would like the Dutch people to have more knowledge of the culture of their country of origin. Now they regularly feel treated in a certain way by the Dutch people they meet, and they have the feeling that they regularly have to disprove prejudice: "I have had to explain several times that women in Syria can really drive cars." (Focus group Leiden). In addition, they experience that they are regularly measured against Dutch standards: "Then my language buddy came to my home and asked me immediately why I had bought such a large TV." Finally, status holders themselves are keen to make a contribution to Dutch society and use their talents and skills, but do not feel invited to do so: "I have offered to be involved in the programme a couple of times, but nothing has been done". Or another quote from the same status holder: "It is important that refugees not only receive help but that they can also give it: they have something to offer" (Focus group Haarlem).

This need for equality between status holder and volunteer corresponds with the emphasized agency of the status holder that I discussed in section 2.1. Integration is a process and influenced by many actors, including civil society and the status holders (Penninx, 2005; Favell, 2003). The aspirations of Van Heelsum (2017) suggest that status holders have their own expectations of the integration process and make rational choices within this process. That is why this demand for equality in the process is not surprising.

Various initiatives are aware of this risk and are trying to respond to it. One of the initiatives in Leiden, for example, deploys a new project team for the organisation of each initiative, in which newcomers (not only status holders but also other newcomers in Leiden) also participate (Interview 17, April 16, 2018). Another initiative has chosen to organise thematic meetings for volunteers, offering background information on the various cultures. The matching process between volunteer and status holder is also being looked at more critically in order to increase the chance that a good click will be achieved between the two (Interview 18, March 8, 2018).

Tension between short-term and long-term goals

Since the introduction of Wi2013, municipalities no longer have the full formal role in managing the integration process of status holders, but the formal responsibilities have been divided among several parties, such as COA and DUO. However, as I explained in Chapter 1, municipalities are formally responsible for social guidance and can determine the content and duration of this guidance themselves; as a result, both the duration and the content of the guidance process differ for the studied municipalities, varying from six months to a maximum of two years. After this guidance process, status holders are assigned to regular help and they can approach care agencies with their questions. However, many representatives of informal and formal initiatives are concerned that this period of up to 2 years is too short for status holders to cope with their challenges.

In addition, municipalities have responsibilities under other legislation, such as the participation statement, to help vulnerable residents (including status holders) find work as quickly as possible by providing support and to get them out of the benefit system. This has created a tension between short-term activities aimed at work and social support for the integration process of status holders, which often takes a long time. A status holder from Leiden explains this tension: "I feel punished for the fact that I learn quickly. Because I have an active working attitude and learn Dutch quickly, I am now pushed to go to work right away while I would like to continue my studies."

The municipalities have various programmes aiming to help status holders to get to work as quickly as possible and to take them out of the benefit situation. Not only from the perspective of the participation declaration, but also because many people agree that paid work often leads to better and faster integration into society This is in line with the legal and socio-economic dimensions of Penninx (2005) integration theory. This focus on work often involves working with targets that must be achieved by the social and commercial institutions involved in order to get status holders to work as quickly as possible. However, these targets focus on quantity rather than quality and the consequence is that many status holders end up in workplaces that are either far below their level or do not contribute to better integration (Interview 1 and 7). A status holder in Leiden explains this: "They are trying to fill gaps and lead people to workplaces where they need them."

Examples mentioned in the interviews are status holders who were obliged to take on paid work, in which their integration process was actually obstructed; for example, they were no longer able to complete their Dutch language lessons properly (often 3 times a week). In practice they did not have to speak Dutch at their workplace, or they were accompanied by staff members who did not even speak Dutch well themselves (Focus group Delft). In addition, such a 'job-match' sometimes has psychological consequences for status holders: some status holders are highly educated and feel very undervalued by the 'jobs' offered to them. Other status holders suffer from shame or unwillingness due to cultural differences and feel unable to live up to the high expectations from their families or their immediate surroundings. A status holder from Delft: "They mainly try to offer me a certain kind of jobs, such as cleaning. I would like to set up my own business, but they do not help me with that. I have the feeling that they want me to get to work as quickly as possible, but do not look at my qualities."

Municipal policy is therefore often aimed at giving status holders a 'regular' place in society as soon as possible. However, status holders, with their specific background, individual problems, cultural differences and distance to the labour market, often need a longer period to get used to the new life they started in the Netherlands: "I knew who I was in Syria, but here in the

Netherlands, I have to reinvent myself. Before I can really become part of Dutch society, I need to know myself well and find out where I stand in this society." (Focus group Leiden).

Status holders can really feel a moral pressure, as explained by Schinkel (2010), imposed by the municipality to become a 'good citizen' as soon as possible: "The last sentence of every formal letter I receive is approximately as follows: "If you do not comply with this, your benefit will be stopped". I find this annoying." (Focus group Leiden).

Social and civic initiatives can be a valuable and humane addition to the usual municipal policy with its focus on quick integration results. A local citizens' initiative in Haarlem has worked to organise language courses in pleasant places (such as cultural institutions), so that status holders can really enjoy learning the language and at the same time gain work experience (Interview 18, March 8, 2018). This is in contrast to the often low-valued places that are otherwise offered by the business community. Another social initiative in Delft teaches 'employee skills' and offers as many places as possible where status holders are busy with the Dutch language: "Not everyone who leaves is immediately ready for work, but sometimes they have built up more self-confidence, which is already good" (Interview 7, April 24, 2018).

Continuity in finance and capacity

Social and civic initiatives are often dependent on funding from various funds, whether or not supplemented by subsidies from the municipality. Funding is often provided on a project or pilot basis. In those available budgets, however, there is no financial room for improvement or renewal, and grants and project applications are often awarded for short periods, making financial continuity a challenge and requiring a great deal of energy and capacity from initiatives. This lack of financial continuity makes it difficult for them to plan for the long term. One of the representatives of the initiatives indicated that it would make sense to get more structural help from the municipality, because "we contribute to the social welfare of citizens and that is, after all, a responsibility of the municipality" (Interview 17, April 16, 2018).

In addition, for most initiatives it is a long-term challenge to engage volunteers and to recruit new ones. In the second half of 2015 and in 2016, when a large group of refugees arrived in the Netherlands, there was an enormous willingness among citizens to volunteer. Now, a few years on, the focus on the group of status holders has partly subsided because the situation has become more normal: "The fire burned fiercely in 2015, but is now slowly extinguishing" (Interview 2, March 27, 2018). There are also various other reasons why volunteers cannot always commit to an initiative in the long term: for example, the problems of status holders can be experienced as too heavy, the time required of volunteers is too intensive, or the match between volunteer and status holder is not entirely suited. In addition, some volunteers do not find it motivating that status holders have more than one buddy at the same time.

Initiatives are therefore consciously engaged in the sustainable recruitment of volunteers and have found various ways to do so. One of the representatives of the initiatives in Haarlem indicated that the request for help should be split up into projects as much as possible, making it easier for volunteers to come and help (Interview 18, March 8, 2018). At the same time, they do have a fixed core of volunteers, so that status holders always see a familiar face. Another advantage of this system is that status holders meet more volunteers than just a 'regular' buddy. Another initiative in Haarlem is aimed at better support for voluntary measures of vulnerable target groups, so that both the (vulnerable) status holder and the volunteer continue the process in the longer term (Interview19, March 15, 2018). Yet another initiative invests in more outreach: actively seeking volunteers in the city (Interview 20, March 27, 2018).

Measuring results

It is because social and civic initiatives are so dependent on funding from social funds and municipal subsidies that it is important for them to be able to present what the results are. Unfortunately, it is proving to be very difficult to measure the impact of their services using reliably indicators. How do you measure the value from the help of a Dutch woman who has prepared a young Syrian family for the arrival of their baby in the Netherlands? Or the value of a small number of volunteers who, by organizing social activities, provided a glimmer of hope and perspective for refugees in an AZC location? This is also something I found in the

academical debate: the often-intangible nature of the results of the initiatives makes it difficult to define them.

> In Leiden, a small number of highly committed citizens have supported and supervised the refugees from the start, who were still in an AZC location in 2015 and 2016. They stress that warm contact, appreciation and respect for the strength and perseverance of refugees is essential to their integration process: "What we do cannot be measured."
> (Interview 13, April 19, 2018).

I have seen many successes that have increased the personal well-being of status holders in the socio-cultural, economic-cultural and legal dimension, as I will describe in section 5.3. However, it is often these important benefits that are not measurable in citizens' initiatives. In addition, social and civic initiatives often lack the time and capacity to develop and implement comprehensive measurement systems. Finally, there is a risk that status holders, because of cultural differences or dependency relationships, will give socially desirable answers instead of being honest about their experiences.

Both municipalities and initiatives pay attention to this subject and there are examples of municipalities that add to their mainly quantitative progress reports experiences of social initiatives. In addition, some initiatives work with qualitative surveys for 'their' status holders.

> A citizens' initiative that offers language support in Leiden works with an intake interview as standard, in which a number of goals are formulated with the status holder: what do I want to be proficient in, what can I do now, etc. This is followed by an interim evaluation and a final evaluation (Interview 15, April 25, 2018).

5.2 Experiences of the municipalities

Next to the challenges and successes of the initiatives, the experiences of the municipalities are also important while they show the other side of the integration process. As explained in Chapter 2, the agency of municipalities should also be taken into account.

<u>Tension between a focus on short-term results and the need for long-term support</u>

What municipalities find difficult, as I already discussed, is finding a balance between the short and long term. Offering sustainable support to status holders, but at the same time wanting to achieve results in the short term. This tension often occurs when status holders start working. Municipalities are keen to exploit the full potential of status holders and to ensure that they find suitable jobs where they work at the right level, but this is at odds with the aim of getting status holders into work as quickly as possible and getting them out of the benefits situation. In addition, it is a challenge to motivate the status holders to take jobs that the status holders themselves see as below their level. Some status holders are high educated and hope to be able to start again at the same level in the Netherlands. Other status holders do not want to do certain work because of cultural differences and feel ashamed to do so (Interview 7, April 24, 2018). Some municipalities solve this by working with a culture-sensitive approach. Employers are supported to develop a more culture-sensitive approach that helps employers and employees better understand each other, and status holders are offered additional language lessons (Interview 28, April 6, 2018).

<u>Directing and effective cooperation with the parties</u>

Another challenge for municipalities is to keep a watchful eye on language providers. In order to promote integration, status holders benefit from learning the language as quickly as possible. But because providing language courses is no longer in the hands of the municipality, all kinds of organisations can offer language lessons themselves if they meet certain conditions. This means that there are many different language providers, which offer different quality of lessons and the overview is often gone for municipalities. The many language providers make it difficult for municipalities to monitor and influence the quality of language providers, and

advising status holders in this area has become more difficult as well. The municipalities would like to see this responsibility returned to the municipality so that they can direct and control the quality.

In addition, to maintain an overview of the fragmented institutions is a challenge for the municipality. Often there are different agencies that offer help to status holders. For example, one authority for work, one for language, etc. This fragmentation makes it difficult for the municipality to build up a relationship of trust with the status holder, and it would be favourable development if there is one permanent contact person available for the status holders. Next to the reduced overview of language providers and fragmentation of institutions, it is also a challenge to keep an overview of the various initiatives that exist for status holders. The municipalities therefore experience that there is room for more effective cooperation with various parties.

Getting an impression of status holders' well-being and keeping them in the picture

Just as for the initiatives, it is also difficult for the municipalities to deliver customised solutions. Certainly, because they do not always have enough financial resources and time. Every status holder has different problems: where one status holder needs help with administration or other paperwork, another status holder may have more need of practicing the Dutch language. It is difficult to adjust each individual problem. This difficulty is partly due to the fact that the municipalities are not at the front of the civic integration programme anymore.

As a result, they have less knowledge and skills of what is actually going on. It is the ambition of the municipalities to be more at the forefront and to investigate what is needed to bring everyone to the same level of knowledge and expertise. Municipalities would prefer to have more time and financial opportunities to offer better and longer guidance to status holders. The aim is often for status holders to be able to stand on their own two feet after a certain period of time and to solve their problems and requests for help independently, as explained in Chapter 1. In practice, however, this is often not feasible. These are, for example, status holders with

traumas who need psychological help or status holders who do not have the administration up to standards. Because custom work cannot always be delivered, some status holders choose to solve their own problems or to leave them as they are. Instead of the formal bodies, the status holders then seek help from informal organisations, or no other organisations at all. This sometimes causes them to disappear from the eye for the municipality.

Shortage of financial resources

As mentioned earlier, it is a challenge for municipalities to offer the right guidance with the budget they have. As a result, they have to make choices about the ways in which they want to use the guidance: is it by establishing a permanent contact person for the status holders, or is it by offering more help in administrative matters, for example. Municipalities would also like to be able to invest more in the initiatives that exist for status holders, because these are often a good addition to the services that municipalities provide.

5.3 The added value of initiatives

The previous sections have shown that local initiatives experience a lot of challenges during their acts of solidarity. But at the same time, they are of great influence on the integration of status holders and can achieve a lot with their actions. In this section, these results are described and discussed, and with this an answer to the main research question is formed.

As I explained in Chapter 2, I focussed on the added value to integration processes during this study. I looked at the three dimensions of Penninx and three indicators of Van Heelsum, which are the importance of knowledge of the Dutch language, having a job and becoming a part of a local community. Furthermore, I focussed on the process of integration on the local level, who was involved and how these actors influenced each other. In the studied municipalities, there are many local initiatives of citizens and informal organizations that focus on warm reception and support for status holders. Some of these initiatives are really aimed at status holders as a target group, other initiatives have been around for a longer time for other target groups (such

as non-native speakers, low-literate people, and other vulnerable groups) and now expanded their services.

From this study I can conclude that contact between status holders and locals is essential for the integration process of status holders. It helps them practice the language, become familiar with the local community and prevent loneliness and isolation. As discussed before, Van Heelsum (2017) points out the importance of these things. Becoming a part of the local community, knowledge of the Dutch language and having a job all add onto the integration of status holders.

 I found out during this study that regular contact with the Dutch ensures a number of important steps in integration:

- that status holders improve their Dutch by practicing regularly;
- that they have social encounters with people other than those in their existing social network and thus increase their world;
- that they can discover the city they live in and the Dutch culture;
- that they can build up a relationship of trust with someone;
- that they can ask questions about the Dutch system where they would otherwise have difficulty receiving answers.

In addition, social contacts between status holders and Dutch people strengthen the understanding and solidarity of the Dutch, by gaining more insight into the cultures where refugees come from. Mutual social contacts are therefore very important for both status holders and Dutch citizens. It is therefore no surprise that the majority of citizen initiatives focus to a greater or lesser extent on organizing this personal contact. Many of their activities are focused on organizing meetings, offering a listening ear and setting up buddy systems.

A representative from DelftseBuur says that they mainly focus on humanity: "Occasionally a listening ear. That someone confirms it's good that they are here. Acknowledgement, a pillar of support: yes, I listen to you. That is doing well." (Interview 1, March 29, 2018). A

representative of an initiative that offers language groups and language skills to vulnerable groups of status holders in Leiden also emphasises the peace that comes from local initiatives: "Status holders have a lot to do and at the local initiatives they do not have to do that much; they are there for the contact." (Interview 15, April 25, 2018)

> DelftseBuur, a citizens' initiative with more than 200 volunteers organises various meeting places between status holders and locals, such as Koffie NL, Huis NL and Werk NL. With their initiatives Koffie NL and Huis NL they offer a pleasant afternoon where status holders and citizens from Delft can come together, drink coffee, eat together and talk to each other. In this way, they hope to make status holders in Delft feel at home and to work together towards an inclusive society. Werk NL is a recently started initiative where citizens from Delft help status holders with all kinds of matters concerning work and applying for jobs. At all three meeting places, status holders can learn the Dutch language, ask their questions and build up a social network with citizens from Delft (Interview 1, March 29, 2018)

Flexibility and creativity

However, there are even more benefits of citizens' initiatives and engagement in the integration process. The initiatives are - better than formal bodies - able to work flexibly and are therefore able to guide and support status holders in all kinds of ways. In this way, they can offer more 'customised' support than the formal bodies that have to adhere to fixed protocols, targets and budgets. In addition, the personal contact between a status holder and a volunteer makes it possible to offer exactly what the status holder needs. Status holders often feel treated as a group, while there are many individual differences between them. Initiatives that organise many personal social contacts with status holders know what really matters to a status holder and can therefore either respond to it themselves or play a mediating role towards formal bodies.

Because the ideas and initiatives come from the local community itself, there is plenty of room for creativity in creating meetings:

> A social artist from Leiden has worked to build a bridge, to connect the 'old home' with the 'new home' of status holders. She did so by organising the project "Dinner for fortune seekers", started as a graduation project but further rolled out with subsidies from Fonds 1818 and the housing corporation. In this project, she organised 100 round table meetings for a total of 1,000 people, during which meetings were initiated between citizens from Leiden and status holders. The encounters caused a lot of emotions among the participants (Interview 13, April 19, 2018).

Strengthening the social cohesion

In addition to improving the personal well-being of status holders and increasing their chances of integrating sustainably into Dutch society, initiatives also contribute to the feeling of social cohesion in the municipality. In one of the municipalities researched, the arrival of refugees led to the sustainable cooperation of a multitude of municipal and social organizations to make newcomers in the city feel welcome and to help integrate them. For example, several church communities that previously lived at cross-purposes have been working together for a few years now and through their cooperation they have realized a greater commitment to the dynamics in the city.

> A group of status holders, who cook weekly on a voluntary basis in a restaurant in Haarlem, is very diverse and so close to each other that they often help each other without the intervention of the Dutch initiator. She describes a group of people who do not judge each other and who fully respect each other. The volunteers often stay connected to this restaurant for a long time (Interview 26, March 26, 2018)

It is often this kind of important value that concerns citizens' initiatives, and the examples are endless. I found many successes that have increased the personal well-being of status holders; that solved bureaucratic problems (legal); that prevented social isolation (socio-cultural); that have given status holders more confidence; that have reduced their reluctance to make contact with others; that found a paid or voluntary workplace for them (socio-economic); that have helped improve their Dutch (socio-economic), etc. These voluntary acts of solidarity do not only affect the three indicators of added value by Van Heelsum (2017), but also touch upon the three dimensions of Penninx.

Chapter 6. Conclusion – local initiatives fill the gaps

The main objective of this study was to explore and understand the roles and value of local initiatives in the integration process of status holders and how the local solidarity initiatives complement each other and the current local policies. I collected perceptions and experiences of representatives of local solidarity initiatives, representatives of municipalities and status holders in the municipalities to answer the following question: *What is the added value of local solidarity initiatives in Delft, Haarlem and Leiden to the integration processes of status holders?* In order to do so, I set up two sub questions to guide me in this process of data collecting:

1. Why do these local solidarity initiatives exist and what is their goal?
2. What are the experiences, challenges and successes that the local solidarity initiatives face in the integration process?

I would like to start off with answering the sub questions to work towards the answer of my main research question, some reflections and recommendations based on my findings.

The local solidarity initiatives

The local solidarity initiatives I researched are of all kinds of sizes and with diverse activities. In general, the local solidarity initiatives focus on Penninx' social-cultural dimension of integration (2005): organizing activities for meeting new people, bonding, learning the Dutch culture, and other ways of socializing. Some initiatives already existed and simply changed their focus point to status holders or included the status holders in their regular activities, others started in 2015 with the arrival of status holders. A lot of initiatives started off with just a few people wanting to help but more and more volunteers joined their initiative. Their activities started off small: setting up a few buddy-matches or organizing one social activity. But as soon as more volunteers were willing to help, the bigger and more professional most initiatives became. These initiatives are mostly examples of informal, active solidarity on the local level as explained by De Beer and Koster (2009).

The initiatives saw the need and necessity to step in. The municipalities were from the start focussing on the AZC's, the housing, and the basic needs of the status holders whereas the initiatives saw that the status holders needed more than that. This also shows the agency of civil society as explained by Tonkens (2015): the local communities acted upon the problems they saw and had their own idea of what the status holders needed. The municipality aimed at giving status holders a 'regular' place in society as soon as possible, but the initiatives saw that the status holders needed more time and help to fit in. The initiatives offer a more personal kind of help, regarding them as individuals and focussing on their personal experiences. Depending on the help they can offer, their goals differ. But in general, the initiatives want to contribute to the social-cultural integration of the status holders. To make them feel at home, make them feel understood, appreciated and show them that they are part of this society. This answers the first sub question of my research.

The experiences, challenges and successes

There are some mixed experiences with the integration process of status holders from representatives of municipalities and initiatives. Some representatives of initiatives are dissatisfied with the interpretation of integration policies by their municipality and believe the municipalities shirk their responsibilities and pass them on to the initiatives. This growing responsibility expected from the initiatives can be seen as an example of the current participation society, as explained in Chapter 1. This study shows that some representatives of initiatives and status holders agree with Schinkel (2010) that this change towards the participation society may lead to moral citizenship. Others are quite satisfied with the involvement of their municipalities and their devotion to the integration of the status holders. It seems that the experience of the representatives of initiatives depends on the position that the municipality takes in the integration process. This information adds onto the different roles of Denters, et al. (2013), but from the perspective of the civil society actors. It shows that to municipalities the three roles might be comprehensive, but to the civil society actors the governing role is missing; the local communities miss the control, overview and inclusion of all the active actors in the integration process.

The municipality that have regular contact with the representatives of initiatives, listen to their signals and act upon these signals are described as most positive, also by the status holders themselves. Whereas other municipalities with less interest in the activities of the local initiatives, do not see the necessity or added value of these initiatives and do not make the representatives of initiatives feel appreciated. In these cases, the municipalities do not include the initiatives in their decision-making, because they cannot see the importance of social contacts and other social-cultural integration activities. This is in line with my expectations that formal institutions mostly focus on Penninx' socio-economic and legal dimensions of integration (2005), because they believe that those are the most important indicators of integration. Furthermore, this shows that the agency of status holders and civil society gets neglected in this process, as is often done in the academical debate on integration as well.

The initiatives face major challenges, but also succeed in many ways. Mutual cooperation between initiatives and cooperation with the municipality is not always easy to achieve, which leads to a lack of overview and therefore a less optimal service for status holders. In addition, many of the representatives of initiatives I have spoken to indicate that organising continuity in finance and voluntary engagement requires a great deal of effort on their part. The fact that it is difficult for them to make their results tangible and measurable plays a role in this. Furthermore, representatives of local initiatives and municipalities indicate that it is not easy to create and maintain an overview of how things are going with status holders. But although they struggle with these challenges, they also create a great deal of successes in the integration process of status holders, on which I elaborate in the next section. Thus, the answer to my second sub-question what experiences, challenges and successes initiatives face, is that the experiences diver between the initiatives, but there seem to be common success factors and challenges they have to overcome.

The added value of local solidarity initiatives

To conclude and answer the main research question: citizens' initiatives play an important role in the integration process of status holders because of their 'humane' contribution. They often

focus on organising and facilitating direct personal contacts with locals, promote local social cohesion and can, through their flexibility, provide more customised services than the formal, regular bodies that are bound by protocols and standard processes. Moreover, social and civic initiatives have a wealth of experience working with volunteers and, thanks to this extensive network, often know what really matters to individual status holders. In addition, they ensure that status holders who do not or no longer fall within the scope of a government-organised process are given the attention and support they need. And with this important role they take, they add towards the indicator of integration of Van Heelsum (2017) by making the status holders a part of the local community in the first place. Next to this, they help status holders with knowledge of the Dutch language and in some cases with getting a job or internship. In this way, local solidarity initiatives help status holders obtain their aspirations and have a satisfactory life, and help them with their civic integration process. Moreover, as Favell (2003) and Ager, et al. (2002) also stressed, it is important to include all kinds of perspectives on integration because this influences the focus of integration. The initiatives do this, by seeing the status holders as individuals with their own needs and ideas and including them in their own integration process.

To answer the research question, the added value of local solidarity initiatives in Delft, Haarlem and Leiden to the integration processes of status holders is that they can offer things that the municipality with their policies cannot offer, namely a personal approach where people take time to see the individual, flexibility to listen to them at times outside office hours, providing them with custom-made solutions because of their committed position and their knowledge of the personal problems and the appreciation of status holders as a human being that gives them confidence and motivation. As a representative of the municipality of Delft said: "The municipality will have to focus on its core task: what do you, as a municipality, focus on? And to give that piece of attention, piece of love, that's not our focus. That is work from person to person, and it has to be done by neighbours." (Interview 8, April 4, 2018).

Reflection

This study aimed to fill a knowledge gap on the added value of local solidarity initiatives to the integration process of status holders. This is done on a theoretical and methodological basis, looking into concepts of integration, civil society actors and solidarity and including actors of several perspectives. As section 1.3 showed, this study adds onto relevant topics in both social as scientific areas, and that is why it is important to reflect on this study and see what is has added onto both fields. In this section, I reflect on the process of this study, the results and in what ways this study is limited.

As discussed before, the perspective of the local, especially that from the initiatives, adds onto the understanding of the integration process. This study shows that integration is not just a matter of implementing policies, but involves several actors that add onto this process in different, sometimes immeasurable, ways. De Waal (2017) explained that there are many opinions on integration, the ones of politics, the local communities, the status holders themselves and many more, and that is why it is important to study the perspective and input of each actor, as is tried to do with this study. This study very specifically highlights in what ways initiatives add onto this integration process by expressing solidarity, and how this is experienced by status holders. In that way, this study also adds onto the understanding of solidarity and its relevance, especially under modern conditions like individualization and current policy changes in the Netherlands that focus on self-reliance as explained by Komter (2004). Although the influences of individualization and self-reliance are noticed in this study, the solidarity that is shown by the initiatives does not seem to be weakened by these modern conditions.

This study helps the initiatives and municipalities understand in what ways they can work together, what challenges they might face and what their value to the integration process is. It examines what gaps there are in integration policies and how initiatives can help fill these niches. Furthermore, it proposes ways for initiatives to improve themselves and for municipalities to work together with the initiatives. This study can be used as a critical reflection

for municipalities on their integration policies, the roles they take within this process and the ways they try to help status holders integrate.

Despite the positive reflections on this study mentioned above, I would like to reflect on the limitations of this study as well.

Firstly, as already mentioned in paragraph 3.3, there are some limitations of the methodology in this study. Due to this research methodology being a qualitative case study, using a small sample size in three municipalities, it is difficult to generalize the results to other municipalities. As a consequence of this lack of generalization, the external validation of the study is weaker. This happens more often with case studies, because of the research being done on a smaller scale. On the other hand, this does not mean that this research is not valuable to the persons included in the research or the municipalities in which the case study is carried out.

Another limitation on the methodology part is the way respondents were approached. Due to the limited knowledge of Justice & Peace and no existing overview on local solidarity initiatives by the municipalities, I was forced to rely on the knowledge of the initiatives and their overview of other active initiatives in their municipality. Using snowball sampling as a method to approach more potential respondents caused the possibility to reach respondents out of the networks of respondents to be limited. This limitation influences the spread of the sample for this study. Next to this, snowball sampling was used to find status holder who were willing to cooperate in the focus groups. Especially since a lot of status holders were sceptical towards the interviews, the snowball sampling ensured in a quick manner to set up the focus groups. However, a disadvantage is that the backgrounds of these respondents do not differ much and they were all in some way involved with the initiatives, which questions the representatively of this sample.

Moreover, I experienced that a lot of representatives of initiatives embraced this study as an opportunity to express their negative view on the municipality or other formal institutions. This

bias may have caused the respondents to look only at the negative experiences with their municipality, although there might have been some positive experiences as well. I noticed this bias with the focus groups as well. That is why during the interviews and focus groups, I deliberately asked if there also were any positive experiences.

At last, this paper cannot provide a comprehensive review of the integration process since the focus is primary on the initiatives. Although interviews with representatives of the municipalities took place, these actors are under-represented in this study. Furthermore, the focus groups with status holders were mainly focussed on their view on the initiatives, and not so much on the integration process as a whole.

Recommendations

In my opinion, the successes of these initiatives can be exploited even more by organising more direction and coordination, for which the municipality seems to be the most suitable actor. A better overview of local services for status holders can be created by managing the local field of formal and informal actors involved in integration more effectively. In this way, initiatives and organisations can refer more to each other, cooperate better with each other and learn more from each other. It also prevents different parties from fishing in the same pond, for example in recruitment of volunteers, or from creating double shifts in service. The responsibility of this coordination should be clearly defined so that communication between the actors can be improved.

Next to this, the conflict of short-term and long-term goals are in the way of status holders integrating, and thus policymakers should balance this vision and focus on sustainable policies that do not only look good on paper but work in practice as well. Municipalities should more often rely on their flexibility and think outside the boxes of the bureaucracy. An example of thinking outside the box is increasing the self-governance of status holders; often, municipalities look at status holders as the ones who need help, not the ones who can take measures themselves. The municipality could, for example, create a place where information is

available about various forms of service provision, so that those who are able to do so can make their own choices about what they need.

Furthermore, it is important to be aware that solidarity is not an inexhaustible resource, and has to be appreciated and cherished. The solidarity around Europe, as already described in Chapter 1, seems to be eroded over the years, and it is important to be aware that this erosion too can happen on the local level. I have seen different ways to cope with the solidarity initiatives in Haarlem, Delft and Leiden, and these different ways have their effect on the intensity and sustainability of them. Since the work of these initiatives is so valuable, it is important to let the initiatives know they are appreciated, are taken seriously and are seen as a full partner in the integration process.

At last, in this study I found that the attitude of the municipality towards local informal initiatives is crucial in order to make optimal use of the local informal capacity. Are municipalities genuinely open to local initiatives that they have not devised or that approach integration in a slightly different way than they themselves? In doing so, do they also take account of the results, which are sometimes not immediately measurable, of initiatives of this kind? In my opinion, municipalities that dare to embrace and support local strength have the greatest chance of successful integration of status holders in their area.

To bring these societal recommendations into fulfilment, more research is needed. It would be beneficial for municipalities to choose a role that fits the cooperation with other actors, based on theoretical findings. That is why more research on the roles of Denters, et al. (2013) would help the municipalities make the choice on which role would work best in their municipality. Recommended is to expand these roles with more focus on governing, because this study shows that civil society is missing that in their municipality. More research can identify and explain this new role and municipalities can learn from it. Studying what would be the best role for each municipality could be done on a national level, with comparison between several municipalities so that findings are more generalizable. Furthermore, an extensive look into the

cooperation between municipality and initiatives, and between the initiatives themselves can indicate what factors influence this cooperation and add onto the literature on civil society cooperation.

With reference to future research, focus on all actors in the integration process would be valuable. Since this was a limitation of this study, the focus of future research should not only contain the local initiatives and the status holders, whose needs and opinions are often missing in the definition of integration, but also other actors such as formal institutions and municipalities who influence the integration process. By doing this, representative respondents should be a high priority, to make sure all kinds of initiatives, respondents and other actors are included in the research. In this way future research can create a better understanding of the integration process of status holders, which will benefit not only the academic debate but also the solidarity in society.

Bibliography

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2004). *The Experience of Integration: A qualitative study of refugee integration in the local communities of Pollockshaws and Islington.* London: Home Office

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of refugee studies*, *21*(2), 166-191.

Ager, A., Strang, A., O'May, F., & Garner, P. (2002). Indicators of integration: a conceptual analysis of refugee integration. Report to the Home Office Immigration Research and Statistics Service.

Alencar, A. (2018). Refugee integration and social media: a local and experiential perspective. *Information, Communication & Society*, *21*(11), 1588-1603.

Algemene Rekenkamer (2017, January 24). Inburgering: de eerste resultaten van de Wet Inburgering 2013. Retrieved from https://www.rekenkamer.nl/publicaties/rapporten/2017/01/24/inburgering

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Beer, de P., & Koster, F. (2009). *Sticking together or falling apart?: solidarity in an era of individualization and globalization*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Boeije, H. (2005). *Analyseren in kwalitatief onderzoek: denken en doen*. Amsterdam: Boom Onderwijs.

Bolt, G. S., Beneker, T., van Liempt, I. C., Visser, K., & Zill, M. O. (2017). European Policy Brief. The Assets of Urban Diversity. Retrieved from https://www.urbandivercities.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/DIVERCITIES-Policy-

Brief-06-WP8-FInal.pdf

Castles, S., Korac, M., Vasta, E., & Vertovec, S. (2002). *Integration: Mapping the*

field. London: Home Office

CBS (2016, December 22). Helft Nederlanders is kerkelijk of religieus. Retrieved from

https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2016/51/helft-nederlanders-is-kerkelijk-of-religieus

CBS (2018a, March 27). Meerderheid bevolking voor opvang vluchtelingen. Retrieved from

https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2018/13/meerderheid-bevolking-voor-opvang-

vluchtelingen

CBS (2018b, September 6). Bevolking op 1 januari en gemiddeld; geslacht, leeftijd en regio.

Retrieved from,

https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/03759NED/table?ts=1536918808040

Cope, M., & Kurtz, H. (2016). Organizing, Coding and Analyzing Qualitative Data. In N.

Clifford, M. Cope, T. Gillespie and S. French, *Key Methods in Geography* (3rd)(647-

664). London: Sage.

Dagger, R. (1997). *Civic Virtues: Rights, Citizenship, and Republican Liberalism*. New York,

NY: Oxford University Press.

Daskalaki, M., & Kokkinidis, G. (2017). Organizing solidarity initiatives: A socio-spatial

conceptualization of resistance. *Organization Studies*, *38* (9), 1303-1325.

Denters, B., Tonkens, E., Verhoeven, I., & Bakker, J. (2013). *Burgers maken*

hun buurt. Den Haag: Platform31.

Duberley, J., Johnson, P., & Cassell, C. (2012). Philosophies underpinning qualitative

research. In G. Symon & C. Cassell, *Qualitative organizational research: Core*

methods and current challenges (16 – 34). London: Sage.

Dunn, K. (2005). Interviewing. In I. Hay, *Qualitative Research methods in Human*

Geography (2nd) (79 – 105). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1964). *The division of labor in society.* New York: The Free Press

Duyvendak, J.W., Pels, T. and Rijkschroeff, R. (2009). A multicultural paradise? The cultural factor in Dutch integration policy. In J. Hochschild, and J. Mollenkopf. *Bringing Outsiders In* (129-139)*.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Edwards, M. (2004). *Civil Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Einwohner, R., Kaire, J., Sinclair-Chapman, V., Subramanian, M., Tormos, F., Weldon, L., & Wu, C. (2016). *Active Solidarity: Strategies for Transnational Political Cooperation in Contexts of Difference, Domination, and Distrust.* West Lafayette: Purdue University Working Group on Social Movements, Diversity, and Inclusion.

Engbersen, G. J., Dagevos, R., Jennissen, L., Bakker, A., Leerkes, A., with additions of J. Klaver and A. Odé (2015). Geen tijd te verliezen: van opvang naar integratie van asielmigranten. WRR-Policy Brief 4. Den Haag: Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2014). Handbook on European law relating to asylum, borders and immigration. Retrieved from http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/handbook-european-law-relating-asylum-borders-and-immigration

Eurostat (2017). Asylum statistics. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics#Asylum_applicants

Favell, A. (2003). Integration nations: The nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe. In M. Bommes and E. Morawska, *International migration research: Constructions, omissions and the promises of interdisciplinarity* (13-42). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Fukuyama, F. (2001). Social capital, civil society and development. *Third world*

quarterly, *22*(1), 7-20.

Gemeente Delft (2018, July 9). Halfjaarrapportage programma statushouders. Retrieved from

https://ris.delft.nl/document.php?m=1&fileid=589717&f=228adfbc3fa9ba6a92a4b5efc
9e336c2&attachment=0&a=9349

Gemeenten van de Toekomst (2018). Land in beeld: taakstelling huisvesting

vluchtelingen. Retrieved from

https://www.gemeentenvandetoekomst.nl/themas/fysieke-leefomgeving/artikel/land-
in-beeld-taakstelling-huisvesting-vluchtelingen/

Gray, R., Bebbington, J., & Collison, D. (2006). NGOs, civil society and accountability:

making the people accountable to capital. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability*

Journal, *19*(3), 319-348.

Heelsum, van A. (2017). Aspirations and frustrations: experiences of recent refugees in the

Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40*(13), 2137-2150.

Kallius, A., Monterescu, D., & Rajaram, P. K. (2016). Immobilizing mobility: Border

ethnography, illiberal democracy, and the politics of the "refugee crisis" in

Hungary. *American Ethnologist*, *43*(1), 25-37.

Klaver, J. (2017). Local responses to the refugee crisis in the Netherlands. Reception and

integration. Retrieved from
http://docplayer.net/storage/64/51525827/1532471351/MHJ-
njNESmbhpfQUxxz96g/51525827.pdf

Komter, A. (2004). *Social solidarity and the gift*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University

Press.

Koolmees, W. (2018, July 2). Hoofdlijnen veranderopgave inburgering [Letter of government].

Retrieved from

https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2018/07/02/kamerbrief-

hoofdlijnen-veranderopgave-inburgering

Longhurst (2016). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. In N. Clifford, M. Cope,

T. Gillespie & S. French, *Key methods in geography* (117-132). London: Sage.

NOS (2015, September 9). Hoe wil de EU de vluchtelingen verdelen. Retrieved from

https://nos.nl/artikel/2056803-hoe-wil-de-eu-de-vluchtelingen-verdelen.html

NOS (2018, June 11). Uitgeprocedureerde asielzoekers: te weinig cijfers voor inzicht in

beleid. Retrieved from https://nos.nl/nieuwsuur/artikel/2236013-uitgeprocedeerde-asielzoekers-te-weinig-cijfers-voor-inzicht-in-beleid.html

NRC (2015, April 21). Lokale VVD'ers willen wél bed-bad-brood. Retrieved from

https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2015/04/21/lokale-vvders-willen-wel-bed-bad-brood-1487319-a301471

Penninx, R. (2005). Integration of migrants: Economic, social, cultural and political

dimensions. In M. Macura, A.L. Macdonald, W. Haug, *The New Demographic*

Regime. Population Challenges and Policy Responses (137-152). Geneva: United

Nations.

Poppelaars, C., & Scholten, P. (2008). Two worlds apart: The divergence of national and local

immigrant integration policies in the Netherlands. *Administration & Society, 40*(4), 335-357.

Potter, R., Binns, T., Elliott, J. and Smith, D. (2008). *Geographies of Development. An*

introduction to development studies. London: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting Qualitative Research: Working in the Postpositivist Traditions:*

Working in the Postpositivist Traditions. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Rijksoverheid (2015). Bestuursakkoord Verhoogde Asielinstroom. Retrieved from

https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2015/11/27/bestuursakkoord-verhoogde-asielinstroom

Robeyns, I. (2007). The Capabilities Approach: A Theoretical Survey. *Journal of Human Development, 6*(1), 93–117.

Robinson, V. (1998). Defining and measuring successful refugee integration. Report of conference on *Integration of Refugees in Europe*, Antwerp 12-14, November. Brussels: European Council on Refugees and Exiles.

Rozakou, K. (2016). Socialities of solidarity: revisiting the gift taboo in times of crises. *Social Anthropology*, *24*(2), 185-199.

Schillemans, T. (2014). Veelvormige veelfrontenoorlog. Empirische analyse van terugtocht, optocht, stilstand of hervorming van de Nederlandse staat. *Bestuurskunde*, *23*(3), 16-27.

Schiller, N. G., & Çağlar, A. (2009). Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: Migrant incorporation and city scale. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies, 35*(2), 177-202.

Schinkel, W. (2007). Tegen 'actief burgerschap'. *Justitiële Verkenningen*, *33*(8), 70-90.

Schinkel, W. (2010). The virtualization of citizenship. *Critical Sociology*, *36*(2), 265-283.

Scholten, P., & Van Nispen, F. (2015). Policy analysis and the 'migration crisis': Introduction. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice, 17*(1), 1–9.

SER (n.d.). Initiatieven. Retrieved from https://www.werkwijzervluchtelingen.nl/initiatieven.aspx

Sotiropoulos, D.A., & Bourikos, D. (2014). Economic Crisis, Social Solidarity and the Voluntary Sector in Greece. *Journal of Power, Politics & Governance*, *2*(2), 33-53.

Spencer, S. (2006). *Refugees and other new migrants: a review of the evidence on successful approaches to integration.* Oxford: Centre on Migration Policy and Society.

Strang, A., & Ager, A. (2010). Refugee integration: Emerging trends and remaining a

agendas. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *23*(4), 589-607.

Tonkens, E. (2009). 'Burgerparticipatie en burgerinitiatief'. In Tonkens (red.), *Tussen*

onderschatten en overvragen. Actief burgerschap en activerende organisaties in de wijk

(135-141). Amsterdam: SUN.

Tonkens, E. (2015). Vijf misverstanden over de participatiesamenleving. *Tijdschrift voor*

gezondheidswetenschappen, *93*(1), 1-3.

Tonkens, E., & Verhoeven, I. (2011). *Bewonersinitiatieven: proeftuin voor partnerschap*

tussen burgers en overheid. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam

Tweede Kamer (2003–04). *Contourennota Wmo*, vergaderjaar 2003–2004, 29538, nr. 1.

United Nations (1951). UN Convention on the Status of Refugees. Retrieved from

http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2017).

Migrant/Migration. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-
sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/migrant/

United Nations General Assembly (2002). Human rights of migrants (A/57/292). Retrieved

from

https://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/shared/shared/mainsite/policy_and_research/un/57/
A_57_292_en.pdf

United Nations General Assembly (2005). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on

22 December 2005. Resolution 60/209. Retrieved from

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/60/209&referer=http://

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2016). *Hungary*. *Progress under the global*

strategy beyond detention 2014 – 2019, mid-2016. Retrieved from

http://www.unhcr.org/protection/detention/57b5832d7/hungary-progress-
report.html?query=hungary

Verhoeven, I. (2010). 'Ruimte geven aan initiatieven van burgers'. *Rooilijn, 10*(4), 238-245.

Verhoeven, I., & Tonkens, E. (2013). Talking active citizenship: Framing welfare state reform in England and the Netherlands, *Social Policy and Society*, *12*(3), 415-426.

Vluchtelingen in de versnelling (VIDV) (n.d.). Initiatieven Nederland breed. Retrieved from http://vidv.nl/initiatieven-nederland-breed/

Volkskrant (2015, September 15). Dreigt er een 'asieltsunami'? Retrieved from https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/dreigt-er-een-asieltsunami-~b1f61242/

VVD (n.d.). Integratie. Retrieved from https://www.vvd.nl/standpunten/integratie/

Waal, de T. M. (2017). Conditional belonging: A legal-philosophical inquiry into integration requirements for immigrants in Europe (summary of dissertation). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Wilde, de M., Hurenkamp, M., & Tonkens, E. (2014). Flexible relations, frail contacts and failing demands: How community groups and local institutions interact in local governance in the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, *51*(16), 3365-3382.

Appendices

Appendix I. Overview of actors

Haarlem

Informal actors:

Socio-economic	Legal (political)	Sociocultural
Bedrijf & samenleving		Stem in de stad
		Sport support
		Vrijwilligerscentrum Haarlem en omgeving
		Wereldkeuken
		Kerken in Haarlem
		Hotel De Koepel

Formal actors:

Socio-economic	Legal (political)	Socio-cultural
Gemeente Haarlem	Gemeente Haarlem	Gemeente Haarlem
Vluchtelingenwerk NWN	Vluchtelingenwerk Haarlem	Thuis in Haarlem
Bibliotheek Zuid-Kennemerland-Schalkwijk		Sportsupport

Delft

Informal actors:

Socio-economic	Legal (political)	Socio-cultural
DelftseBuur		Taalcollectief Delft
Taalcollectief Delft		DelftseBuur
Engineers for Refugees		Delft Mama
School's cool		Interkerkelijk Diaconaal Beraad

Stichting Stunt		Engineers for Refugees
		School's cool
		Protestantse Kerk

Formal actors

Socio-economic	Legal (political)	Socio-cultural
Gemeente Delft	Gemeente Delft	Taalhuis DOK
Participe	Participe	
Stichting Stunt		
Taalhuis DOK		

Leiden

Informal actors:

Socio-economic	Legal (political)	Socio-cultural
Ekklesia Taalgroep		We are Leiden
		Roos Tulen
		Fransje Bernard

Formal actors:

Socio-economic	Legal (political)	Sociocultural
Gemeente Leiden	Gemeente Leiden	
Vluchtelingenwerk Leiden	Vluchtelingenwerk	
i-DOE Leiden		

Appendix II. Personal characteristics of the respondents

Respondent number	Organization	Sex (F/M)	Function	Source of sampling	Recording (Y/N)
1	DelftseBuur	F	Project initiator	Direct	Y
2	Protestantse Kerk	M	Volunteer	Direct	Y
3	Taalcollectief Delft	F	Project initiator	Direct	Y
4	Taalhuis DOK	F	Project initiator	Snowball sampling	Y
5	Interkerkelijk Diaconaal Beraad	M	Volunteer	Direct	Y
6	DelftMama	F	Project member	Direct	Y
7	Stichting Stunt	M	Project initiator	Snowball sampling	Y
8	Municipality of Delft	M / F	Policy officer work & income and coordinator status holders / Director public interest	Snowball sampling	Y
9	School's Cool	F	Project member	Direct	Y
10	Participe Delft	M	Coordinator refugees	Snowball sampling	Y
11	Engineers for Refugees	M / M	Project member	Direct	Y
12	Municipality of Leiden (JAS-project)	F	Project member	Snowball	N
13	Fransje Hubart / Roos Tulen	F / F	Social worker at Libertas / Social artist	Snowball sampling	Y
14	Vluchtelingenwerk Leiden	M	Team leader of social guidance and housing	Direct	Y
15	Taalgroep Ekklesia	F	Project member	Direct	N
16	i-DOE Leiden	F	Project manager	Direct	N
17	We Are Leiden	M	Project initiator	Direct	Y
18	Stem in de Stad	F	Coordinator Refugees and Volunteers	Direct	Y

19	Vrijwilligerscentrale	F	Project manager	Direct	Y
20	Thuis in Haarlem	F	Project manager	Snowball sampling	N
21	Geloof in de Stad	M	Network coordinator	Direct	Y
22	Bibliotheek Zuid Kennemerland-Schalkwijk	F	Advisor linguistic skills	Direct	Y
23	Sport Support	F	Neighbourhood sports coach	Direct	Y
24	Hotel de Koepel	F	Part of coordination group	Direct	Y
25	Vluchtelingenwerk Noord-West-Holland	M	Region manager	Snowball sampling	N
26	De Wereldkeuken	F	Initiator	Direct	Y
27	Bedrijf en Samenleving	F	Consultant	Direct	Y
28	Municipality of Haarlem	F	Coordinator Social Program Status holders	Snowball Sampling	Y

Appendix III. List of questions for semi-structured interviews and focus groups

    1. Questions for local solidarity initiatives

Goals, services and organisation of the initiative

- What is the underlying vision of the initiative?
- What are the goals of the initiative?
- How long has this initiative existed?
- Why did this initiative start? What was the problem?
- What services are provided? (and why precisely these services)
- For whom are the services provided? (geographical/target groups). Why this area/these target groups?
- How many refugees are reached? Per year? Per month?
- How many people work for this initiative? Payment/voluntary?
- How are employees trained and supported in their work?
- What do you consider to be the added value of this initiative, compared to municipal services?
- What do you consider the added value of this initiative, compared to services of other initiatives?

Cooperation with the municipality

- How is cooperation with the municipality carried out?
- What is going well, what is not going well in the cooperation?
- What impact does local municipal policy have on the initiative? Positive or negative?
- What do you need from the municipality? Will it be delivered?
- Do you have (administrative/financial) obligations towards the municipality?
- Are you or is your initiative involved in the decision-making process of the municipality on relevant policy-making? If so, in what way?

- Do you experience that the municipality is committed to the integration of refugees? On what basis do you experience this?

Other initiatives in the local context

- Do you know of any other initiatives aimed at refugee integration? Do you work together and if so, in what ways?
- Is there a party within the municipality that directs refugee integration?
- How would you describe the cooperation between the local initiatives themselves and with the municipality? (possibly on the basis of a metaphor?)
- Are there other local initiatives that provide the same services as your initiative? Do you feel you have to compete? In what way?
- Do you exchange information with other local initiatives for learning purposes?

Continuity/sustainability

- How is your initiative financed? What does this mean for the continuity of your initiative?
- Are you able to offer your services in the long term and to attract employees?
- What do you need to deliver your services? (and to be able to continue to deliver)
- Do you measure the results and/or impact of your work and if so, how? Which indicators do you include?
- Do you experience change/development in the way refugee integration is handled and if so: what kind of change? What impact does this have on your initiative?
- What do you consider to be the successes of your initiative? What do you think are success factors?
- What are the challenges you encounter in your initiative?
- What do you personally consider to be the greatest opportunities and obstacles to improve the integration of refugees in the Netherlands?

Conclusion

- Would you like to add something to this interview that has not yet been discussed?
- After all interviews we would like to organise a group discussion with a number of status holders, to ask them about their personal experiences about their integration process. Do you have suggestions for contact persons?

2. <u>Questions for the municipalities</u>

Organisation of integration process within the municipality
- What is the purpose of the municipal refugee policy of the municipality?
- What do you mean by the term 'integration'?
- What do you consider to be the main tasks of the municipality in the field of refugee integration?
- How are these tasks organised within the municipality? How are they coordinated?
- What are the most important municipal partners in integration policy in the municipality?
- How does the municipality inform itself about the local situation and integration needs?
- Do you have programmes in the field of refugee integration and if so, what kind of programmes are these?
- What funding structures does the municipality have for refugee integration?
- Does the municipality measure the progress of refugee integration and if so, how? Which indicators are included?
- Are results of local solidarity initiatives included in municipal progress reports? If so, in what way?

Cooperation with local initiatives
- In what ways is there cooperation with local initiatives? Which initiatives are being collaborated with?

- What is going well, what is not going well in the cooperation?
- How would you describe the cooperation of local initiatives with the municipality and between the local initiatives themselves? (Possibly by means of a metaphor?)
- What do you consider to be the main added value of local initiatives compared to the role played by the municipality?
- What is your opinion on the quality of local initiatives supporting refugee integration? On what basis do you have this opinion?
- What does the municipality need from local initiatives to improve the integration of refugees within the municipality?
- On the basis of which criteria does the municipality decide to cooperate with local initiatives or to financially support them?
- If there is cooperation with local initiatives: what administrative and/or financial obligations do they have towards the municipality?

Experiences
- Do you experience change/development in the way refugee integration is dealt with at national level and if so: what kind of change? What impact does this have on the services and/or the role of the municipality?
- What do you consider to be the municipality's successes in the field of refugee integration? What are success factors?
- What are the most important challenges in refugee integration within your municipality? How does the municipality deal with this?
- What does the municipality need to operate effectively in refugee integration?
- In your personal opinion, what are the greatest opportunities and obstacles to improve the integration of refugees in the Netherlands?

Conclusion
- Would you like to add something to this interview that has not yet been discussed?

- After all interviews we would like to organise a group discussion with a number of status holders, to ask them about their personal experiences about their integration process. Do you have suggestions for contact persons?

3. Questions for the status holders

Short personal introduction (per person)

- Name, age, nationality, arrival date in the Netherlands?
- Where do you live (neighbourhood) and how (alone/family/group)?
- Previous education and work experience in the country of origin?
- Which trajectory from country of origin to the Netherlands?
- Where does your closest family live?
- Current situation: education, work, voluntary work, other activities?

Group questions:

Reception in the municipality

- What were your experiences when you arrived in this municipality in the area of:
  - Housing
  - Integration course
  - Dutch courses
  - Job search
  - Social contacts
  - Health services
  - Moral support
  - Help if you had questions about anything
- What was important for you when you arrived?

Building up a new life

- What is important for you now/what do you need most?
- Are you supported in these? In what way(s)?
- Which barriers do you experience in building up a new life in the municipality?
- Which parties do you turn to in overcoming these barriers?
- What was helpful/good in building up a new life in the municipality?
- What are your plans and ambitions?
- How confident are you that you are able to fulfil your ambitions?

Appendix IV. Used codes for analysing

ATLAS.ti Report

Codes

○ aantal vluchtelingen [number of refugees]

○ achterliggende visie initiatief [underlying vision initiative]

○ begin initiatief [start initiative]

○ behoefte initiatieven [needs initiative]

○ behoefte vluchteling [needs refugee]

○ diensten gemeente [services municipality]

○ diensten initiatief [services initiative]

○ doelstelling initiatief [goal initiative]

○ obstakels vluchtelingen [obstacles refugee]

○ rol gemeente [role municipality]

○ samenwerking andere initiatieven [collaboration other initiatives]

○ samenwerking gemeente [collaboration municipality]

○ succes initiatief [success initiative]

○ toegevoegde waarde initiatief [added value initiative]

○ uitdaging initiatief [challenge initiative]