



addressed the diversity of its population. During the 1980s, Rotterdam signalled that generic socio-economic incentives were not sufficient to deal with the deprivation of ethnic minority groups. Consequently, targeted socio-economic measures were designed for these groups. These were the first in their kind in the Netherlands. In the early 2000s, the multicultural backlash (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010) made facilitating targeted measures for ethnic minorities politically undesirable. Under a more right-wing government, local policies then came to focus on targeted socio-cultural assimilation instead. This was followed by a generic targeting of all citizens of Rotterdam, when immigrant integration policies were replaced by an urban citizenship framework between 2006 and 2014. In response to most recent developments, integration was explicitly put back on the policy agenda again in 2014. This chapter analyses the development of Rotterdam's immigrant integration policies and its target groups over these past four decades.

In the four decades since Rotterdam developed its first integration policies in 1978, the population of Rotterdam with an immigrant background (first and second generation) increased to nearly 50% of the total population. The city counts around 170 different nationalities and on top of that there are increasing numbers of citizens of a second, third and fourth generation 'migrant background' with mixed ethnic backgrounds (COS 2011). Contemporary conditions of immigration are now often understood in terms of the growing scale and complexity of diversity, so called 'superdiversity' (Vertovec 2007). Superdiversity is understood as a dynamic interplay of a plurality of variables including country of origin, mode of migration, degree and type of nationality, legal status, socio-economic status, language, religion, and degree and type of transnationality (Ibid: 1024). But the concept also draws attention to other "*axes of difference like gender, education, age cohorts and generations*" (cf. Vertovec 2007; Crul 2015: 54).

The notion of superdiversity is often applied to societies that, due to long histories of immigration, have become so diverse that their diversity has become one of their defining characteristics. This development then is argued to challenge existing models of integration as "*the idea of assimilation or integration becomes at any rate more complex in a situation where there is no longer a clear majority group into which one is to assimilate*" (Ibid.: 57; see also Vertovec 2007; Alba and Nee 2003; Blommaert and Maly 2014; Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009). Whom should be addressed by immigrant integration policies, and can separate groups be distinguished at all? The superdiversity literature suggests that rather than distinguishing and targeting specific ethnic groups in integration policies, these groups have diversified so much that one can no longer speak of clearly bounded groups altogether (Cantle 2012; Alba 2005; Bouchard 2011). According to Vertovec, the intersectionality and plurality of variables relating to diversity is not new, it is however the "*emergence of their scale, historical and policy-produced multiple configuration and mutual conditioning that now calls for the conceptual distinction*" (2007:





















































