ErasmusMC
Universitair Medisch Centrum Rotterdam

Introduction

Erasmus University Rotterdam

1. PUTTING MIGRANTS IN BOXES

> *"I feel very uncomfortable when I have to call – on behalf of the municipality - an older migrant, let's say an illiterate who's in his 60s and has a lot of other problems on his mind – telling him that he is obligated to participate in the integration course. I know that he will get exemption in case that he is suffering from health problems, so in such cases I deliberately ask them about their health so I can find a more appropriate way of dealing with their specific situation."*

(Source: Client-manager, working at the Municipality in The Hague).

This quote by a client-manager working at the municipality in The Hague is a profound example of the many situations that street-level workers encounter in implementing integration policies. While governments – both on a local, national and even on a European level – are concerned with *developing* integration policies in order to to deal with the settlement of migrants that are part of society, it is on the *local level* of street-level workers that such policies actually are implemented in *real-life decisions* that impact on immigrant's lives. In making these decisions, street-level workers are dealing with local complexities of migrant integration that often are not grasped in broader integration policies. Moreover, the example of this client-manager shows that the individual cases that they are assigned to deal with, do not fit the 'boxes' that are presumed in policy guidelines. In this example, the aged migrant, has been living in the Netherlands for more than 40 years and until now had very little interaction with Dutch government. The migrant worked for most part of his live in a factory and spoke a bit Dutch to communicate with his colleagues. The physical work in the factory impacted heavily on his health and financial situation, which led him to live a very simple life in the midst of his family and neighbours. The more the client-manager learned about the pathway of the migrant, the more difficult it became for her to classify him in the box of 'settled migrants' (in Dutch: oudkomers), who were recently called by the municipality to participate in Dutch integration courses. The street-level worker in this case learned her ways of dealing with local complexity and found creative ways of dealing with the frustration and discomfort that she experienced. She was convinced that this specific incentive of forced participation would not lead to a better integration of her client in society.

This example shows that migration and integration are in essence examples of policy fields that are complex, which means that there is not one clear problem definition nor a one-way solution that is accepted by everyone involved. Moreover, it shows how governments are confronted with several factors that may limit societal steering in practise. This stands in sharp contrast with narratives of policy-makers and politicians that presume a great

influence of state's or governments to actually control migration and integration. A recent example concerns a Dutch politician - leader of the Liberal Parties – who called for several measures to improve migrant integration in the Netherlands, such us forcing migrants to participate in courses on democratic values and obligating migrant parents to send their children to day-care centres to improve their language skills. In addition, and even more contested, was his plan to double crime penalties for migrants in 'disadvantaged parts of the city', as a way of combatting what he calls 'failed integration'. This exemplifies how in the debate on immigrant integration policy interventions are tended to simplify reality. It does not take in account the complex stories of migrants, which street-level workers are confronted with. Boswell (2011) argues that the simplified narrative on migrant integration eventually will lead to failing the expectations of the public. These expectations are high, especially given the politicized and sensitive debate regarding migrants, which has harshened in recent years and in which the stay and integration of migrants in society has become more and more problematized by politicians in several European countries (Entzinger, 2006). More importantly, such narratives do not fit the reality of street-level workers, who interact with migrants on a more structural basis and who – as we will see in this dissertation – are struggling with the complexities of governing migrant integration.

My dissertation focuses on migrant integration as a governing problem and approaches the issue from an empirical point of view. I will focus on governing responses by local actors, and unlike many other studies – my starting point lies with *those* who are actually confronted with migration-related challenges, i.e.: migrants themselves and local governments, such as street-level bureaucrats and other public professionals working c.q. confronted with migrants in the policies that they implement or design. I use a qualitative approach, which means that the main data that was generated in this thesis has been collected by systematically extracting causal structures from the data, while keeping very close to the world that migrants, policy makers and –implementers are experiencing, and the decisions or actions that follow the logic of these subjective perceptions of reality. There are many studies focusing on the workings of migrant integration and integration policies, using different (national) integration models to understand immigrant integration. Some of these studies have focused on the national level, others on the local level – and some on the interaction or divergence between the two (Jorgensen, 2012). As Bertossi (2011), and others, have stressed: the problem with these models is that "social actors, from politicians to veiled Muslim women, are portrayed as simply inheriting these ideas, using them and adapting them" (p. 1562). In my view, many of the research that underlies these studies is hence characterized by a top-down approach that does not sufficiently take in account the perspective of *local reality*. A reality which often conflicts with political or policy rationalities, which – the opening quote shows - assume a certain linearity in various causal factors and policy interventions. An implication of such assumptions, brings

us to the belief that governments are very much able to control migration and integration related issues. *I disagree.* This dissertation will show the reality of dealing with complexity on a local level. It will do so by showing the complex and rich integration trajectories of migrants on the one hand, and the responses of governing actors that directly or indirectly work with migrants on the other hand. In concrete, this means that my research question breaks down in several questions that focus on reconstructing the series of bureaucratic contacts that migrants had during their integration trajectories, unravelling how these street-level workers deal with the dilemmas of their work, and understanding how and why migrants and local governing actors try to manage their identity in this new era of superdiversity. Following Wagenaar (2007), I argue that these governing actors may not have the analytical understanding that researchers or policymakers possess, but they do have "a ready understanding of the complexity of the issues that affect them" (ibid, p. 26). *How do they then make sense of and deal with this complexity?*

In sum, this thesis uses the *perspectives* and *interactions* from both migrants and local governing actors that are closely involved in responding to the complexities of migration-related diversity to grasp the bigger picture of governing migrant integration. This picture is more complex than existing political narratives are showing us. More importantly, such a picture adds to our understanding of the social reality which governments are dealing with and about the effects that their actions have "on the ground".

2. GOVERNING MIGRANT INTEGRATION ON THE LOCAL LEVEL

This section will provide some background on governing steering literature in general, and connects it correspondingly to the issue of governing migration-related integration in particular.

2.1 Migration-related diversity in cities
The need to manage diversity is felt more than ever before– in particular on the local (city) level. Cities are impacted by migration patterns, because these are the places where immigrants arrive and settle, thus shaping the cities' economy, ethnic composition, cultural and religious landscape as well as city's politics and government (Bolt & van Liempt, 2018; Saunders, 2011). Subsequently, this means that cities are confronted with questions regarding cultural diversity, but also regarding linked policies such as education, urban planning, health and social services (Wood & Landry, 2008). How city governments respond with regards to the challenges and opportunities that cultural diversity brings *matter*s because it determines whether cities will succeed or be overwhelmed "in the conditions arising out of the new global interdependence" (ibid). But even though there are cities that perceive

Erasmus University Rotterdam

the migration-related diversity as a promising asset or strength, "local governments […] are seldom prepared to cope with the ad hoc policies needed to integrate people with different cultural, social and religious traditions into the urban society" (Balbo & Marconi, 2005: 706).

Adding to the challenge of governing diversity is the reality of global migration flows that consist of "newer, smaller, transient, more socially stratified, less organized and more legally differentiated immigrant groups" (Vertovec, 2007). Some authors – e.g. Vertovec (2007) and Tasan-Kok, van Kempen, Raco & Bolt (2014) – speak of "superdiverse" or " hyper diverse" cities, implying that diversity has become so intense that one can no longer speak of minority issues connected to specific groups, but rather a transformation of urban life in general. This diversification that Vertovec (2007;2010) – and others - point to hold not only true for the migrant's country of origin, but also applies to the socio-economic, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds of immigrants as well as their migration channel and their legal status (ibid.). This has implications for how cities deliver local services to its residents, how they use and (re)create public spaces, (Pestieau & Wallace, 2003), but also for how cities engage in identity building and how they deal with social cohesion related concerns. Consequently, it is only fair to expect that social discussions and political cleavages will be provoked as a result of such policy decisions, which are often connected to broader dilemmas as "how to manage religious questions, language diversity and the cultural practises of immigrants" (Zapata-Barrero, 2015: 3). This is especially true for European cities, in which "urban management responsibilities have generally been shifted from central to local governments" (Balbo &Marconi, 2006: 707), making local authorities key actors in urban decision-making (see also Ponzini, 2014).

At the same time though, local governments have to take in account national policies and cannot respond autonomously, as governing complex social problems such as migrant integration involves not only local, but also national governments. Moreover, the attention of national governments for migration integration has only increased, especially after the millennium. The increasing attention for migrant integration is reflected in the many changes that this policy field has undergone in the last two decades, which on its turn also indicates its contested nature. More and more political parties have expressed their concerns regarding migrant integration, placing the issue in the broader context of national identity and social cohesion in Dutch society. This discourse was accompanied by stricter policies regarding migrant's integration, which is mainly expressed in civil integrations tests for migrants aiming to promote of Dutch values and norms (Joppke, 2007). On a local level, integration policies of a city as Rotterdam have taken very different shapes, depending on the composition of the political coalition in which right-wing parties were represented during some time period while absent in others (Dekker & van

Breugel, 2018). In Amsterdam on the other hand, we witnessed some changes in the realm of minority policies, but in general the promotion of intercultural dialogue and diversity policy remained strong throughout the years (Uitermark, Rossi & van Houtum, 2005).Local integration policies sometimes hence differ from national guidelines, are interpreted differently in local policy practices or even contradict with the national level (e.g. Alexander, 2007; Caponio and Borkert, 2010 and Penninx et al, 2004). In any case, integration policies are influenced by multilevel interactions that lead to mutual exchanges between local and national level governments (Dekkers et al, 2015). Moreover, key to these policy making processes is the deliberate choice of certain problem definitions, target groups and policy tools. In the case of migrant integration, a policy field that is constantly changing in the midst of a polarized debate, the pressure to simplify and categorize migrants into a 'manageable' number of boxes is more evident in these choices and processes than in other policy domains. The question then is, how do (local) governments respond and which instruments are there to *appropriately* and *effectively* deal with migrant integration? In the next section, this question is hence addressed.

2.2 How to respond: classic command and control versus laissez faire?

City governments face the task of developing and (re)designing policies that on the one hand suit the urban transformations that the city is experiencing and on the other hand their policies need to take in account national guidelines, which are often the result of a politicized debate that is characterized by a harshened tone regarding migrants (Crul & Schneider 2010; Entzinger, 2009). Traditionally, governments had a range of tools "at their disposal for exercising their influence over the economy and society" (Linder & Peters, 1989). The distinction between legal, economic and communicative instruments that Van der Doelen developed is widely used by many authors (Peters & Van Nispen, 1998), whereas Howlett (2009) speaks about "resources" that governments have at their disposal to counter societal issues, distinguishing between the traditional use of coercive authority, financial incentives, the use of government staff and organization, but also information and deliberation as a way to guide societal behaviour.

The degree in which governments apply such specific governing tools or mechanism to achieve policy goals varies and is often connected to more abstract preferences for certain 'governing conceptions' (Bekkers, 1993) or 'government modes' (Kooiman, 1999), ranging from a more command-and control way of interfering to a more laissez-faire attitude in which governments lean on the capacity of society to reach social goals. Kooiman (1999) in this respect distinguishes a) 'hierarchical governing', which corresponds with the classical mode of steering, assuming that governments are very much capable to exercise social control; b) co-governing, in which "parties co-operate, communicate 'sideways', without a central or dominating governing actor"; and c) 'self-governing', based on the idea that

societal actors in modern societies are capable of governing themselves. In particular the 'command and control' way of approaching societal problems has been criticized and "accused of being costly and inefficient, of stifling innovation, inviting enforcement difficulties and focusing on 'end of pipe' solutions" (Sinclair, 1997: 530). Alternative ways of government interference have hence been object of interest more than ever before. Among many other scholars, Salamon (2002) has argued that governments can no longer rely on their own resources to solve societal problems, rather due to the complex nature of many problems they are forced to consider collaborative problem solving, characterized by "its reliance on a wide array of third parties in addition to government" (p.). Howlett (2009) argues that the coordination and management of these complex networks of interorganizational actors is becoming more and more problematic (Howlett, 2009). The immense body of literature on the shift from government to governance, demonstrates the awareness of the need to govern, steer and guide developments in society differently.

Consequently, many scholars have analysed governance networks in order to understand the role of these networks in articulating, developing and implementing public policies (see e.g. Kickert, Klijn & Koppenjan, 1997; Klijn 2008; Pierre & Peters, 2000). In our current societies, governments face far more demands from a broad scale of actors, while at the same time being more dependent of parties in- and outside of government to address social problems. Koppenjan & Klijn (2015) stress that these patterns of interactions are not always harmonious or cooperative, because there are many different interests and perceptions of policy problems and policy measures that can solve these problems. Klijn (2008) points out that governance process remain political, as in essence they are about "reconciling different values as well as the different actors representing those values" (p.509). This change towards a network society makes societies less governable, which on it turn leads to limitations in government steering. Some authors have questioned if these practises are indeed a late twenty-century response to complexity, or whether "what is changing is not so much the practise of government but the accounts that are given of this practise" (see amongst others Colebatch, 2009: p. 65,). Another part of the debate concentrates on the question if governments indeed are losing power. Some scholars have questioned this and claim that governments are still very much in charge, acting directly or indirectly, "but nevertheless continue to act significantly in every mode of governing, from hierarchical to market and network forms" (Capono, Howlett and Ramesh, 2015). Zehavi (2012), for example, has argued that critiques on classical approaches of government steering are hence not necessary leading to policies that acknowledge the boundaries of governmental interference.

This proves to be true for immigrant integration policies as well. When, for instance, we take a closer look at integration policies in many European countries - in particular in

places where right-wing populist voices reached governing positions – dominant policy discourses reflect the belief that governments are capable of solving issues of immigrant integration (Favell, 2003; Boswell, 2011). As a reaction to hostile public attitudes towards immigrants, Western European governments have developed policy solutions that are grounded in regulative and coercive force to incorporate immigrants in the 'new' society that they are now part of. Countries such as the Netherlands, France and Germany, have for example introduced restrictive legislation that necessitates settled and new immigrants to pass their integration tests (Joppke, 2007).

Subsequently, Favell (2003) argues that discussions in Western Europe on immigrant integration show the dominance of what he calls a "nation-state integration-paradigm" that promotes the idea that governments are actually able to achieve immigrant integration through systematic intervention of collective political action. Examples of such policy interventions include naturalization and citizenship rights, anti-discrimination laws, redistribution of socioeconomic funds for minorities in deprived areas as well as policies on housing, law and order and on tolerating cultural practises of immigrants. Much of these strategies demonstrate the belief that integration is something that a state can 'do', which on its turn precludes "the idea that a society might achieve an integrated state of affairs without the state's intervention" (ibid, p. 3). After all, immigrants are subject to many other social interactions and social powers at the local labour market or at the city-community level, which cannot necessarily be 'governed' by public authorities.

This is especially true for present-day societies that are characterised by their "diversity, complexity and dynamics". In such contexts, Kooiman (1999) argues that "to be effective – that is to say, up to standards such as efficiency, legitimacy and fairness – social-political governing itself has to reflect the diverse, dynamic and complex character of the challenges it faces." (p. 75). In reality though, many governing attempts prove to be inefficient, unjust or weak, because "problem definitions are too simple, policies too static and audiences too generalized" (ibid.). It are especially local governments that are confronted with these oversimplified, static and too generalized policies, especially since the shift from government to governance does not only entail a horizontal, but also downward vertical shift from national to sub-national, regional and local levels. Governments are not necessarily only 'steering' (setting policy goals), but also implementing those goals in actions through selection and use of instruments on the local level ('rowing', see e.g. Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

In this context, Hupe & Hill stress the fact that deregulation and decentralization "strengthen the discretion of public organizations to make binding decisions, presumably leading to more efficient and effective results (In Bekkers, Dijkstra and Fenger, 2016). This of course

corresponds with the broader literature on policy implementation, in particular those studies that compare prescribed policy instructions to the practice of policy implementation. Works on 'street-level bureaucrats' or 'frontline-workers' recognizes the role and impact of these workers and the discretionary room that they possess on the one hand and the struggle and coping that this brings with it on the other hand (see for example Lipsky, 1980, Freidson, 2001; Tummers et al, 2012). Street level bureaucrats, frontline workers or implementers are not simply "a vehicle for giving effect to the choices of political leaders", but need to be treated as distinctive identities within governments (Colebatch, 2009: p. 59). More recent work by Zacka (2017) profoundly shows how 'the street' is not only passively implementing policies, but is actively contributing to what these policies actually *mean*. In doing so, street-level workers "are moral agents in their own right with distinctive moral dispositions" (ibid, p. 249).

For the study of migrant integration, this means that one needs to use different lenses to the same situation to really grasp government actions. Governments are rational actors, have a variety of disconnected specialisations to their disposal *and* function in an arena of rivalry and conflict *all at the same time* (Allison 1971, as paraphrased by Colebatch, 2009). Special attention is required for implementation practices by street-level implementers, which in the field of migrant integration are under-researched. When shedding light on these implementation practises, one can finally understand - as Pressman & Wildavsky (1984) already pointed out almost half a century ago – why great expectations of politicians on the national level are dashed at the local level. In this dissertation, we will unravel how the high expectations of politicians that presume that an aggressive approach to migrants will lead to better outcomes, is downplayed by the complexities of local reality which these workers encounter.

2.3 'Selling' migration-related diversity in an area of diminishing collective identities

While national governments more and more are adopting restrictive policies – that intend to 'control' successful migrant integration – local governments are put in a much more difficult position when it comes to deciding 'where they stand'. Local governments, who are often directly confronted with the social tensions as well as the economic benefits that result from the cultural diversification of city populations, are forced to respond to the needs of both native residents as immigrants. This exposes them to serious policy dilemmas.

On the one hand, cities can choose to show an explicit societal or community commitment to respect and accommodate diversity. However, if cities decide to respond in this manner, it becomes important for them to "legitimise spending money on 'soft' policy areas such as

diversity by their connection to 'hard economic profits'" (Hoekstra, 2015: 1800). Some cities have followed this particular narrative on diversity and have hence used their multi-ethnic resident composition as a way of strengthening their international competitiveness on the world stage, for example by using diversity as a key selling point in their branding strategies. In addition to their own attempts to 'sell' migration, city governments are also faced with the task of understanding the interests that other actors have in encouraging or rejecting migration-related diversity, which means that they need to set up "a system of governance focusing on these actors, as well as on urban migrants" (Balbo & Marconi, 2005: 715).

On the other hand, explicitly accepting or embracing diversity – regardless of the question of if this is done for economic or social purposes - comes with the necessary risks, because investing *too much* in the needs of new residents can also decrease the attractiveness of the city to property owners or potential investors (Frisken & Wallace, 2003). More importantly, the latter authors argue that local authorities are reluctant to explicitly embrace cultural differences and investing in the needs of immigrants, given the hostile attitude of old city residents who "view immigrants as competitors for scarce public amenities or as drains on local tax bases" (ibid, p. 176). This is in line with the general observation that arrival and settlement of migrants is experienced by (some) native-residents as a threat for national identity, social cohesion and community building. Local governments are thus forced to constantly rethink and redefine their responsibilities towards many interests and actors – "institutions and individuals, public and private, legal and illegal" (Balbo & Marconi, 2005: 715) - that are not necessarily in favour of approaching diversity as an asset, but which city governments – *especially* in the new reality of governance - can't ignore.

At the heart of this balancing act of local governments lies a specific question that really underlies the dilemma: how do (local) governmental responses to migrant integration *impact* on identity and feelings of belonging? Inevitably choices that cities and national coalitions eventually make, prove to impact feelings of identification and belonging of both natives and migrants. Political discourses as well as actual policies are accompanied by a narrative, a storyline, a message on who "we" as a nation or a city "are" – which inherently includes and excludes people in society. National identity only becomes meaningful by the fact that nations distinguish themselves from significant 'others' (Triandafyllidou, 2013). The political and societal discussions on migrant integration are clearly characterized by attempts to define what the Dutch identity entails and especially: what (and hence who) is *not* perceived as *"Dutch"*. The many references to the national history by politicians, which is translated in concrete interventions as newcomers are expected to learn about the national history and Dutch values that are highly valued in society - marks the heat of the issue (see also Entzinger, 2006).

Erasmus University Rotterdam

The negative discourse regarding migrants on the national level has proven to impact negatively on migrants, as they identify less with the Netherlands or the Dutch culture at large than their native-peers (Crul & Heering, 2008; Entzinger 2009). Furthermore, the heated political and social discussions also impact on natives: the settlement of migrants in society is becoming experienced more and more as threatening to Dutch culture, especially the visible presence of Muslim migrants in public space. The building of mosques, the use of religious symbols such as headscarves or statements of orthodox imams – are all feeding these feelings of anxiety, threat and insecurity among the Dutch (Tonkens, Hurenkamp and Duyvendak, 2010). Interestingly, research shows us that even though migrants feel less at home in the Netherlands, they can identify more strongly with the cities that they are living in and this identification seems to be less effected by the politicized debate on migrants in the Netherlands. Collective identity-building on the local level has hence the potential of becoming an important means or 'tool' in dealing with migration-related diversity, or more concrete: a means for enhancing migrant integration. In the midst of this contested policy field, governments are expected to make choices regarding their identity.

Local governments have hence to find *ways* to govern, steer and guide migration-related diversity, *within* the limited capacity that they actually possess to influence or manage the complexities of diversities. The loss of governance control in the urban context led some authors to claim that "public policies can be no more than experiments inserted into the 'relational ensemble' of the city" (Kearns & Paddison 2000, p. 846), whereas others have a more optimistic view when it comes to the impact of government policies on urban complexity (p. 847). In deciding how to respond, cities are confronted with many interests and values that they need to consider and take in account. Identity and building a collective sense of belonging is one that is hardly to be ignored in the new context of growing migration. This necessitates a constant weighing up of the pros and cons of alternative government choices, which demands the art of carefully balancing standards such as efficiency, legitimacy and fairness. Surprisingly though, not many studies have investigated the range of local policies and political choices available to large cities in the globalized context in a comparative manner (Polese & Stren, 2000: p. 12). "Fewer still have attempted […] to sketch out the structural basis of local policies in relation to the challenge of cultural and ethnic diversity" (ibid). This dissertation therefore revolves around the question of how local governments are making sense and are responding to the challenges of increasingly diverse societies. In the next sections I will further explain the focus of this research, including its methodological, theoretical, and practical relevance.

3. RELEVANCE AND CONTRIBUTION

Integration of migrants in receiving societies have been object of study for many years now. The body of literature on migrant integration is immense, even though the whole concept of 'integration' has also been criticized and questioned by many authors (e.g. Schinkel, 2018; Favell, 2019; and many others). Instead of abandoning the concept of immigrant integration as a field of research, some authors advocate it as a governance technique that can be critically studied (see for example Hadj-Abdou, 2019). Existing studies on (the governance of) immigrant integration however, are often based in a top-down approach with little attention for the behaviour of immigrant groups themselves (see e.g. Favell, 2001) or with little focus on governmental workers that actual work with migrants on a frequent basis (van der Leun, 2006). With exception of a few studies there is not much research regarding street-level bureaucracy and migrant integration. Focusing on street-level bureaucrats is hence in line with recent calls to recognize the agency of local actors and their power and influence (Forrest and Wissink, 2017). This corresponds with the claim of Bertossi (2011, see section 2.1) that the focus on national models leads to neglecting of migrants - and I would also claim street-level workers - as social actors that are not only simply inheriting, using and adapting to ideas. This dissertation goes beyond the limited narratives of these top-down models by unravelling the governing of migrant integration, using the perspectives of local actors, with a detailed account of where there ideas take power from, and the processes and mechanism through which they shape social reality. The theoretical relevance of this research thus lies in in offering a more comprehensive and contextualized understanding of the governing of migrant integration, by using the perspectives of those that are most closely involved. In doing so, I bring together various theoretical bodies of literature, in a way that has not been conducted before. In chapter 2, I apply a complexity theory perspective on migrant integration, which to my knowledge has not been applied before in the field of migration and integration. In chapter 3, a street-level bureaucracy approach has been adapted to understand the dilemmas and coping strategies of integration coaches, integration teachers and client managers working with migrants on a frequent basis. As I wrote in the above, there is a strong call to recognize the agency of local actors – such as street-level bureaucrats - and their power and impact. In chapter 4, I use inter-ethnic contact literature to understand under what conditions and with which aims migrants use social media. Lastly, in chapter 5 – I connect literature on city branding with the literature on intercultural governance.

Findings of this dissertation have societal relevance as well. The issue of migrant integration is at the heart of local, national and European debates and proofs to play a key role in how citizens evaluate government performance. Part of this evaluation is reflected in the rise of right-wing populist parties in many European countries, exemplifying the belief

that migrant integration should be handled differently by governments. My research contributes to this debate, by going further than only claiming that governing migrant integration is a 'complex' problem. Instead, my research shows *how* and *why* governing migrant integration is elusive in nature and will in addition plead for alternative tools to deal with the issue. It provides a better understanding of governing migrant integration which can help citizens and policy makers to critically examine the narratives that politicians apply to this matter, a narrative that presumes a great influence of state's or governments to actually control migration and integration. In addition, inclusive city branding can play a role in building an alternative narrative to the current one, a narrative that creates a shared sense of belonging for both natives and migrants. By doing so, this research contributes to the development of more considered practises of governing migrant integration.

4. METHODS AND CONCEPTS

This research used a number of different data sources, theories and methodologies to address the different sub-questions. While each chapter specifies the data and methods specifically, this section offers a brief introduction to the overall methodology.

All research questions were answered by using qualitative methods, which means that I have used mainly interviews and document analyses to unravel the perspectives of both migrants and local governing actors. The main ambition was to capture stories of migrants and those working with migrants or directly confronted with migration-related diversity, as a way of unravelling the black boxes of governing immigrant integration. For answering sub question 1 (see chapter 2) I have conducted 52 semi-structured interviews with migrants, who migrated to the Netherlands from over 21 countries. For answering sub question 2 (see chapter 2), I have conducted 28 interviews with street-level bureaucrats, ranging for integration coaches, integration teachers and client managers, the latter work on behalf on the municipality monitoring civil integration trajectories. Subsequently, answering sub question 3 meant that I conducted over 52 semi-structured interviews with second-generation migrant youth in Rotterdam to inquire about their motivations and considerations concerning social media use (chapter 3). Lastly, sub question 4 allowed for both interviews with 12 branding professionals as a document analysis for the period of 2005-2015 (chapter 4). In all studies that were conducted, my focus was specifically on urban areas in the Netherlands – focusing on cities as Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Dordrecht (which altogether are known as 'De Randstad). In addition, I have focused on governing attempts in the last 10 years – which need to be understood in the context of a harshened political climate regarding migration and integration related issues.

The mixed qualitative methods in this dissertation reinforced one another as all analysed data offered a rich glimpse of the subjective reality of migrants, local governing actors and the interactions between both. The interview questions were hence all directed to get a better understanding of the decisions, actions, motivations and experiences of these actors. In addition, each of the studies in this dissertation used a different theoretical lens, which allowed me to approach my main question from many different angles. The qualitative character of my research is reflected in the fact that my work is not a purely inductive or deductive process: in all studies, I have used theoretical concepts to come to certain expectations. However, the data itself was also intensively examined to systematically extract causal patterns that led to several conclusions. A final remark here is concerned with the fact that one needs to be aware that the arguments introduced in this dissertation, the research questions, the conduct of the research and the report of the research all have been shaped throughout the research *process*. This means that my work represents the ongoing development of thinking about the presented topics. In terms of methodology, this means that some critical reflection of the choices that I have made is necessary. Such reflection will be addressed in chapter 6.

Lastly, I would like to reflect briefly on some key concepts that I use throughout this dissertation. I use the term *migration-relation diversity*, referring to what in social science literature has been used as a descriptive concept, "to recognize increasing heterogeneity in today's societies along ethnic and cultural lines (among others), especially in larger urban areas" (Boccagni, 2015). In recent years, terms as 'super diversity' and 'hyper diversity' have become common in use, again describing what is called the "diversification of diversity", which refers to the intensity of this demographic development that – according to some authors – has transformed urban life in general. Local governments respond differently to migration-related diversity: while some acknowledge diversity explicitly as an important characteristic of the urban economy and identity, others are more reluctant (WRR, 2018). In this thesis I focus on local government *responses* to the reality of migration-related diversity, which urges governments to (re)act. In researching this, I approach 'migrant integration' as a key element in these responses, as integration has been absolutely central in debates in Western- European countries such as the Netherlands (Martieniello & Rath, 2014; Yanow & van der Haar, 2013). The response to migration-related diversity in this context is hence closely related to integration policies.

Secondly, I use the term *local governing actors* as an umbrella term for all local actors that – on behalf of governmental authorities - directly or indirectly deal with migration-related diversity, varying from policy implementers working at the municipality to the local health agency, the local integration course providers and the refugee centre. Based on my fieldwork with migrants (chapter 2), I have identified central local actors that are

interacting on a more frequent basis with migrants. These local actors – that in the minds of migrants are representing Dutch bureaucracy on a local level - were subsequently contacted and interviewed as a way of comprehending their dealings with local complexity (chapter 3). All these actors have several tasks and responsibilities regarding migrants. In concrete this means that I have interviewed integration coaches, integration teachers and client managers working at the municipality to enforce integration instructions. Chapter 5 approaches 'local governing actors' in a specific policy field, namely branding policies. Branding professionals working at the municipality, are both developing and implementing city branding policies on behalf and in collaboration with the city's administration and have relatively high autonomy in developing their branding strategies based on their professional expertise. Nevertheless, the brands are being developed in a highly politicised context, which these professionals can't ignore. They are on the one hand operating based on their professional expertise, but are on the other hand restricted by the political and policy context regarding migration-related diversity. In the remaining of this thesis, I will refer to this group – of street-level workers and branding professionals - as 'local governing actors', meaning that directly or indirectly they are interacting with migrants while representing the Dutch government.

5. RESEARCH QUESTION AND STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS:

This dissertation revolves around the question of how local governments are making sense and are responding to the challenges of increasingly diverse societies. I thereby focus on the empirical reality of government workers and migrants. My research question is as follows:

How do local governing actors make sense of and respond to migration-related diversity and how can these responses be explained?

In order to answer my main question, I have formulated 4 sub-questions that are answered in the following 4 chapters:
- What effect do series of bureaucratic contact have on the integration of immigrants in the Netherlands? (R1)
- Under what conditions are street-level bureaucrats working with immigrants likely to transcend the boundaries of their discretionary space in order to deal with the dilemmas in their work? (R2)
- How can we understand the varying uses of social media for interethnic contact by second-generation migrant youth's motivations of social media use? (R3)

- How and why do cities manage their identity through place branding – in the face of migration-related diversity? (R4)

This dissertation is constructed around these questions and is structured as shown in table 1. As my sub-questions show, I am interested in the role of local governing actors, that are confronted with migration-related diversity on the one hand and policy instructions that need to be implemented on the other hand. This means that I have interviewed many integration teachers, integration coaches and client managers (sub question 2), but also branding professionals that on behalf of the municipality are responding to the urban transformation of the city and are deciding if and how to incorporate migration-related diversity in their brand narrative (sub question 4). My aim was to capture how these workers 'on the front' are dealing with the complexities of governing migrant integration, which are not always addressed in the policy narrative regarding integration or in integration policies itself. On the other hand, these questions also show that I am also interested in the stories of migrants' themselves. With sub question 1, I have used these stories to reconstruct the interaction patterns between migrants and governing actors. And whereas sub

Research question: *How do local governing actors make sense and (re)act to migration-related diversity and how can these responses be explained?*

Research Theme	Chapters	Sub Questions	Published
Governing responses to immigrant integration: micro and macro-level.	2 and 3	1. What effect do series of bureaucratic contacts have on the integration of immigrants in the Netherlands?	W. Belabas & L. Gerrits (2017). Constraints and Facilitators for Successful Integration: How Bureaucratic Contacts Affects Migrants' Pathways. *International Journal of Social Science Studies.*
		2. Under what conditions are street-level bureaucrats working with immigrants likely to transcend the boundaries of their discretionary space in order to deal with the dilemmas in their work?	W. Belabas & L. Gerrits (2015). Going the Extra Mile? How Street-level Bureaucrats Deal with the Integration of Immigrants. *Social Policy and Administration.*
Migrant identity and belonging: impacts on second generation youth	4 and 5	3. How can we understand the varying uses of social media for interethnic contact by second-generation migrant youth's motivations of social media use?	R. Dekker, W. Belabas & P.W.A. Scholten (2015). Interethnic Contact Online. Contextualizing the Implications of Social Media use by Second Generation Migrant Youth. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 36* (4), 450-467.
Governing responses to immigrant integration in a specific policy field: branding policies.		4. How and why do cities manage their identity through place branding – in the face of migration-related diversity?	Belabas, W., Eshuis, J. and Scholten, P. (2019). Branding diversity in Amsterdam and Rotterdam: How political discourses and marketing logic pushes migration-related diversity to the background in place brands. *European Planning Studies.*
Conclusions	6	Answering main research question	

Table 1: structure of this dissertation

Erasmus University Rotterdam

question 4 focuses on place identity of local governing actors, sub question 3 first sheds some lights on identification processes of migrants themselves.

In this section, I will present the outline of the dissertation in more detail. Table 1 schematically summarizes the article titles, the research questions central to these articles, the basis for the empirical work, and where it is published.

Sub question 1 addresses the interaction patterns between migrants and bureaucracies. Subsequently, chapter 2 presents how bureaucratic contacts between migrants and governments take place in a chain of reinforcing or dampening feedback loops that eventually influence the attitude and willingness of migrants to comply and adapt to Dutch society. Here, I reasoned that immigrant integration is directly connected to the (new) reality of migration-related diversity, and thus constantly engages local governing actors. The research shows the dampening and reinforcing reactions of bureaucracy and its importance in explaining attitudes of immigrants as well as their chances to succeed in the country of destination. While it cannot be expected from individual policy makers to oversee the systematic whole of interrelated situations and actions, our work does invite one to challenge existing mental models, in which failure of integration policies is reduced to a problem of migrants (unwillingness to comply) or a government problem ("too soft" policies).

Sub question 2 addresses the dilemmas, decisions and the coping strategies of street-level bureaucrats. Whereas chapter 2 shows the importance of understanding the *system-dimension* in which policies are deployed c.q enacted, chapter 3 zooms in on "what it is that the individuals who comprise the system seem to be doing and how it is that their actions in the large, produce the patterns we see" (Schelling, 1978: p.): how do policy implementers – such as integration coaches, integration teachers and client managers - deal or cope with the complexities of diversity? What are their motivations and considerations in their decision-making? It is only on the micro-level of street-level implementation that the confrontation between the complexities of diversity and actual policy making or policy decisions takes place. It is only at the micro-level of street-level implementation, that weighing up of standards such as efficiency, legitimacy and fairness take place. Chapter 3 hence shows that deliberate government manipulation is even *more complicated* by micro-level choices that implementers make on a daily basis. Here we need to keep in mind that the group of immigrants with whom these street-level workers interact – is very diverse, in terms of country of origin, socio-economic, cultural, religious and linguistic background as well as their migration history and legal status. Moreover, many immigrants are afflicted with multiple (e.g. financial, psychological, health etc.) problems – which sometimes affect their ability or willingness to comply with formal (bureaucratic) requirements re-

garding the integration trajectory. This complex context in which public policies need to be implemented – produces a variety of (re)actions on the part of street-level workers. (Re)actions characterized by a constant weighting up of the pros and cons of alternative behavioral choices, *and* which are very difficult to control by policy makers and politicians. I believe that, in light of this overwhelming complexity and diversity of immigrants lives, the process of how these street-level workers "develop and maintain mental models from which they reason and act" (Gerrits, 2012: 52) has become even more relevant for research regarding governance capacity of (local) governments.

Sub-questions 3 and 4 focus on questions of belonging and identity, and governing strategies that closely relate to identity and belonging. Chapter 4, using the perspective of migrant youth, zooms in on migrant identity in the context of social media, and shows that intra-ethnic social media use is not necessary problematic for integration, but is in many cases also motivated by a struggle with identity and lifestyle. The online reality of migrant integration needs to be considered together with the online reality, as migrant's youth's online and offline lives are very much integrated and online communication deals with very similar complexities as offline interactions. Our work shows that while ethnicity remains a relevant factor online, not all social media use is ethnically orientated as it mainly dependent on the needs and motivations of the users. This indicates the complexity of experienced identification of migrants, which cannot merely be reduced to ethnicity or home country, but reflects a variety of topics and contacts.

Chapter 5, using the perspective of local governing actors, zooms in on city branding, a "softer" policy strategy, which more and more cities are using (Eshuis, Klijn & Braun 2014). It can be defined as a strategy which attempts to influence perceptions about the city, in a more indirect manner. In this respect, it can be classified as a 'soft' policy instrument, which is based on persuasion instead of coercion. It is argued that local governments are more and more involved in branding policies, often driven by the context of interurban competition in which cities try hard to "sell" themselves (Kearns & Paddison, 2000: 845). However, the use of diversity in branding policies by in particular local governments can be initiated with different underlying philosophies or intentions. City branding is thus hypothesized by some authors to not only be a means for optimizing the economic opportunities and the social, cultural and political networks that arise from these relations (see e.g. Schiller & Caglar, 2009), but also to be a key strategy for defining a new shared sense of belonging that can bond citizens to the city (Wood & Landry, 2008; Cantle, 2012). Creating such a new shared sense of belonging in the new urban context is a major challenge for many local governments. Chapter 5 investigates branding policies, as they are hypothesized to play a key role in stimulating or enhancing identification of migrants with the country and city that they live in. In essence, the political and public debates on migrant integration

Erasmus University Rotterdam

revolve around questions of identity and belonging – which is exactly the struggle of migrants themselves. Chapter 5 shows how local governments struggle with diversity in their branding and positioning of the city, which reflects the broader struggle of the city in dealing with migration-related diversity. Given my main conclusions in chapter 2, 3 and 4 – showing the constraints of governing migration-related diversity and the need for new ways of governing– the relevance of exploring the potential of such governing tools goes without saying.

LITERATURE

Alexander, M. (2007). *Cities and Labour Immigration. Comparing policy responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Aldershot, Ashgate.

Allison, G.T. (1971). *Essence of Decision. Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Balbo, M., & Marconi, G. (2006). International migration, diversity and urban governance in cities of the South. *Habitat International*, *30*(3), 706-715.

Bekkers, V.J.J.M (1993). Nieuwe vormen van sturing en informatisering. Uitgeverij Eburon: Delft.

Bekkers, V., Dijkstra, G., & Fenger, M. (2016). *Governance and the democratic deficit: Assessing the democratic legitimacy of governance practices*. Routledge.

Bertossi, C. (2011). National models of integration in Europe: A comparative and critical analysis. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(12), 1561-1580.

Boccagni, P. (2015). (Super) diversity and the migration–social work nexus: a new lens on the field of access and inclusion?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *38*(4), 608-620.

Bolt, G. and I. van Liempt (2018) 'Stedelijke diversiteit en beleid: hoe gaan nationale en lokale overheden om met de groeiende diversiteit in steden' [Urban diversity and policy: How do municipal and national governments deal with growing diversity in cities], pp. 57-77 in G. Engbersen and P. Scholten (Eds.) The World in a City: Migration-Related Diversity and Urban Policy in Europe, The Hague: Scientific Council for Government Policy.

Boswell, C. (2011). Migration control and narratives of steering. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 13*(1), 12-25.

Braun, E., Eshuis, J. and Klijn, E.H. (2014). The effectiveness of place brand communication. *Cities, 41,* 64-70.

Cantle, T. (2012). *Interculturalism: the new era of cohsion and diversity*. Palgrave MacMillan: UK.

Caponio, T., & Borkert, M. (Eds.). (2010). *The local dimension of migration policymaking*. Amsterdam University Press.

Capano, G., Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2015). Bringing governments back in: Governance and governing in comparative policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, *17*(4), 311–321.

Colebatch, H. K. (2009). Governance as a conceptual development in the analysis of policy. *Critical policy studies*, *3*(1), 58-67.

Crul, M. and Schneider, J.(2010). 'Comparative integration context theory: participation and belonging in new diverse European cities'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *(33),* 7: 1249-1268.

Crul, M., & Heering, L. (Eds.). (2008). *The position of the Turkish and Moroccan second generation in Amsterdam and Rotterdam: The TIES study in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam University Press.

Dekker, R., & van Breugel, I. (2018). 'Walking the Walk' Rather than 'Talking the Talk' of Superdiversity: Continuity and Change in the Development of Rotterdam's Immigrant Integration Policies'. In: P.Scholten, M.Crul and P. van Laar (2018). *Coming to Terms with Superdiversity: The Case of Rotterdam*. (p. 107-132). Springer: Cham.

Dekker, R., Emilsson, H., Krieger, B., & Scholten, P. (2015). A local dimension of integration policies? A comparative study of Berlin, Malmö, and Rotterdam. *International Migration Review*, *49*(3), 633-658.

Entzinger, H. (2006). Changing the rules while the game is on: From multiculturalism to assimilation in the Netherlands. In M. Bodemann and G. Yurdakul (Eds). Migration, citizenship, ethnos (pp. 121-144). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Entzinger, H. (2009) 'Integratie, maar uit de gratie. Multi-etnisch samenleven onder Rotterdamse jongeren', *Migrantenstudies, 1:* 8-23.

Eshuis, J., Klijn, E. H., & Braun, E. (2014). Place marketing and citizen participation: branding as strategy to address the emotional dimension of policy making? *International review of administrative sciences*, *80*(1), 151-171.

Favell, A. (2003). Integration nations: the nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe. *Comparative social research*, *22*, 13-42.

Favell, A. (2019). Integration: twelve propositions after Schinkel. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*(1), 21.

Forrest, R., & Wissink, B. (2017). Whose city now? Urban managerialism reconsidered (again). *The Sociological Review*, *65*(2), 155-167.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism, the third logic.* Cambride: Cambridge University Press.

Frisken, F., & Wallace, M. (2003). Governing the multicultural city-region. *Canadian Public Administration, 46*(2), 153-177.

Gerrits, L. (2012). *Punching Clouds: an introduction to the complexity of public decision-making.* Emergent Publications: Litchfield Park, USA.

Hadj-Abdou, L. H. (2019). Immigrant integration: the governance of ethno-cultural differences. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *7*(1), 15.

Hoekstra, M. (2015). Diverse cities and good citizenship: how local governments in the Netherlands recast national integration discourse. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *38*(10), 1798-1814.

Howlett, M. (2009). Governance modes, policy regimes and operational plans: a multi-level nested model of policy instrument choice and policy design. *Policy Sciences, 42:* 73-89.

Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics, 30*(1), 1-22.

Jorgensen, M. B. (2012). The diverging logics of integration policy making at national and city level. *International Migration Review, 46*(1), 244-278.

Kearns, A. & Paddison, R. (2000). New challenges for Urban Governance. *Urban studies. 5*(6): 845-850.

Kickert, W. J., Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. F. (Eds.). (1997). *Managing complex networks: Strategies for the public sector*. Sage.

Klijn, E. H. (2008). Governance and governance networks in Europe: An assessment of ten years of research on the theme. *Public management review*, *10*(4), 505-525.

Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2015). *Governance networks in the public sector*. Routledge.

Kooiman, J. (1999). Social-political governance: overview, reflections and design. *Public Management an international journal of research and theory*, *1*(1), 67-92.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street level bureaucracy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Linder, S.H. & Peters, G. (1989). Instruments of Government Perceptions and Contexts. *Journal of Public Policy. 9*(1): 35-58.

Martiniello, M., & Rath, J. (2014). *Immigrant incorporation studies in Europe: An introduction.* IMISCOE Textbooks: Amsterdam University Press.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). Catalytic government: Steering rather than rowing. *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*, 25-48.

Pestieau, K. & Wallace, M. (2003). Challenges and Opportunities for planning in the ethno-culturally diverse city: A collection of papers- Introduction. *Planning Theory and Practice, 4* (3): 253-258.

Peters, G. & van Nispen, F. (1998). *Public Policy Instruments.* Edward Elgar: Cheltenham UK /Northampton USA.

Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state.* New York: St. *Martin's*.

Polese, M. & Stren, R. (2000). *The social sustainability of cities: diversity and the management of change.* University of Toronto Press Incorporated: Toronta, Buffalo, London.

Ponzini, D. (2014). Understanding cultural diversity policy making by exploring its tools at the urban level. *Kult-ur, 1*(1), 151-164.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland; Or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation*. Univ of California Press.

Penninx, R., Martiniello, M., Kraal, K., & Vertovec, S. (2004). Integration processes and policies. State of the art and lessons. *Research in migration and ethnic relations series*.

Salamon, L.M. (2002). *The tools of government: A guide to the New Governance*. University Press: Oxford.

Saunders, D. (2011), *Arrival City*. London: Windmill Books.

Schelling, Thomas C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. New York: Norton & Company.

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. (2018). Against 'immigrant integration': for an end to neocolonial knowledge production. *Comparative migration studies*, *6*(1), 31.

Sinclair, D. (1997). Self-regulation versus command and control? Beyond false dichotomies. *Law & Policy, 19*(4), 529-559.

Tasan-Kok, T., van Kempen, R., Raco, M., Bolt, G. (2014). Towards Hyper-Diversified European Cities: A Critical Literature Review. *DIVERCITIES, governing urban diversity*.

Tonkens, E., M. Hurenkamp, and J. W. Duyvendak. (2010). Culturalization of Citizenship in the Netherlands. In A. Chebel d'Appollonia, and S. Reich (Eds). (p.233–252). Managing Ethnic Diversity after 9/11: Integration, Security, and Civil Liberties in Transatlantic Perspective. NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Triandafyllidou, A. (2013). National identity and diversity: Towards plural nationalism. In J. Dobbernack & T. Modood (Eds). Tolerance, Intolerance and Respect (pp. 159-185). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Tummers, L., Steijn, B., & Bekkers, V. (2012). Explaining the willingness of public professionals to implement public policies: Content, context, and personality characteristics. *Public Administration*, *90*(3), 716-736.

Uitermark, J., Rossi, U., & Van Houtum, H. (2005). Reinventing multiculturalism: urban citizenship and the negotiation of ethnic diversity in Amsterdam. *International journal of urban and regional research*, *29*(3), 622-640.

Van der Leun, J. (2006). Excluding illegal migrants in the Netherlands: Between national policies and local implementation. *West European Politics*, *29*(2), 310-326.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Superdiversity and its implications. *Ethnic and racial studies, 30* (6), 1024-1054.

Wagenaar, H. (2007). Governance, complexity and democratic participation: How citizens and public officials harness the complexities of neighborhood decline. *The American Review of Public Administration, 37,* 17-50.

Wood, P., & Landry, C. (2008). *The intercultural city: Planning for diversity advantage*. Routledge.

Yanow, D., & Van der Haar, M. (2013). People out of place: allochthony and autochthony in the Netherlands' identity discourse—metaphors and categories in action. *Journal of International Relations and Development, 16*(2), 227-261.

Zacka, B. (2017). *When the state meets the street: Public service and moral agency*. Harvard University Press.

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2015). *Interculturalism in Cities: concept, policy and implementation*. Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham UK /Northampton USA.

Zehavi, A. (2012). New Governance and Policy Instruments – are governments going soft? In: D. Levi-Faur (eds). (p.242- 254). The Oxford Handbook of Governance.