



The integration paradox revisited

Exploratory study on the construction of identity of higher educated
ethnic minorities in The Netherlands

Graduate thesis research master Communication science

University of Amsterdam

3 February 2012

Anna Berbers – 0587613

Supervisors:

Dr. M. N. C. Aarts

Dr. R. van Bronswijk

Abstract

The integration of ethnic minorities and issues related to public perception of these minorities are a much debated subject in The Netherlands, both in media and in politics. Especially the labelling of the group as a whole is a current hot topic in politics. Attitudes related to integration and ethnic minorities are frequently studied; however research on attitudes of ethnic minorities towards the climate in terms of acceptance and discrimination, and related attitudes towards labelling of the group is more rare. Previous research has indicated that perceptions of the integration debate in media and politics, and perceptions of relative deprivation are influential factors for the attitude of ethnic minorities towards the climate in The Netherlands. This paper addresses the relationship between these factors and perceptions of the climate in The Netherlands in an empirical qualitative interview study. The manner in which the participants experience perceptions of the integration debate and relative deprivation appear to be the result of an interplay with the social construction of identity, leading to more positive or negative attitudes. Two different types of identity construction are identified and seem to be related to stigmatization of ethnic minorities. Identity construction appears to be an influential factor for attitudes of ethnic minorities related to integration.

Key words: The integration debate, the integration paradox, relative deprivation, social identity construction, labelling of ethnic minorities.

Content

Introduction	1
Theoretical framework	5
Method	14
Results	19
Discussion	30
References	35
Appendix A	
Appendix B	
Appendix C	
Appendix D	

Introduction

It's time for spring cleaning of *our* streets. If *our* new Dutch citizens want to show their love for the seventh-century desert ideology, *they* can do it in an Islamic country, but not here, not in *our* country. [emphasis added] (Wilders, 2009)¹

The quote by Geert Wilders² is an example of assimilationism rhetoric related to immigration and integration of ethnic minorities in The Netherlands. The societal discussions of integration of ethnic minorities (Roggeband & Vliegthart, 2007), as well as the factors related to the attitudes towards these minorities have been studied extensively (Gijsberts & Vervoort, 2004; Vergeer, Lubbers & Scheepers, 2000). However, there is considerably less research on the attitudes of ethnic minorities towards the Dutch society (Gijsberts & Vervoort, 2009).

One of the few studies on the attitudes of ethnic minorities towards Dutch society has resulted in the postulation of what is called the 'integration paradox'. Buijs, Demant and Hamdy (2006) have coined the phenomenon, which implies that those who are most motivated to integrate in Dutch society, are also those who are most vulnerable to exclusionary occurrences. The integration paradox has been studied in quantitative setting by Gijsberts and Vervoort (2009). They found that higher educated ethnic minorities attitudes are more negative towards the climate in terms of acceptance and perception of discrimination, than lower educated ethnic minorities.

The integration paradox seems counterintuitive: why would ethnic minorities who are viewed as most integrated feel less accepted than lower educated minorities? This inverted relationship between education and feelings of acceptance has also been found in other countries, for instance for African Americans in The US (Gay, 2004). Gijsberts and Vervoort

¹ Quote found on a site where statements of Geert Wilders are collected (www.watwilwilders.nl).

² Geert Wilders is a politician who is critical of the Islam and immigration and integration of ethnic minorities (Van der Waal, De Koster & Achterberg, 2011).

(2009) attribute this relationship to feelings of relative deprivation and awareness of the integration debate in politics. Higher educated ethnic minorities experience a higher level of relative deprivation because they compare themselves more frequently to higher educated native Dutch and usually find themselves in a relatively inferior position than their native Dutch counterparts. Additionally, the higher educated minorities were more interested in politics, which increased their awareness of the rhetoric's used by politicians when discussing integration and ethnic minorities (ibid.).

The labelling of the group as a whole is a current area of interest in the Dutch political arena. Dutch citizens with at least one parent that has been born abroad are currently mostly referred to as allochthonous, whereas the native Dutch are referred to as autochthonous. Joram van Klaveren, a Dutch MP for the PVV ³ has been lobbying to extend the definition of non-western allochthonous citizens to third generation immigrants, thereby including citizens with at least one grandparent that has been born abroad. He argues that the broadening of the definition is necessary because non-western allochthonous citizens are disproportionately active in crime and 80 percent of the third-generation is currently younger than ten years old ("PVV will definitie...", 2011). This implies that if the definition is not broadened, we will not be able to monitor the generation's criminal activities and progress in integration in Dutch society, according to van Klaveren (Langelaar, 2011).

The term allochthonous has been criticized by several politicians, due to its perceived exclusionary and negative connotations. Criticism was voiced in 2008 by the Social Democrats who argued that the term allochthonous should be replaced because "this term does not reflect the current situation, whereby these groups have largely become Dutch" (Tweede kamer, 2009, p. 10). They argued that hyphenated identity expression would be preferred, like Moroccan-Dutch, which was considered to be more inclusive (ibid.).

³ The PVV is a political party with strong anti-immigration. Geert Wilders is the party leader (Van der Waal, De Koster & Achterberg, 2011). The translation of the name is "freedom party".

At the very moment this thesis is being written, the Christian Democrats have suggested that the term *allochthonous* should be replaced with 'bicultural' (Hankel, 2010), whereas the Social Democrats advocated 'new Dutch citizen' (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011). Interestingly, the term *allochthonous* was chosen to replace the term *ethnic* or *cultural minorities* because the focus of the new term was on the non-native descent of the immigrants, instead of their ethnic-cultural background. The focus on ethnic-cultural background was thought to be exclusionary and the word *minority* to be stigmatizing (ibid.). Several scholars are now arguing that the dichotomy *allochthonous* and *autochthonous* has the same exclusionary, negative connotations and could possibly contribute to ingroup and outgroup processes in society (Fermin, 2009; Roggeband & Verloo, 2007; Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011).

The labelling of the ethnic minorities, and factors related to the integration paradox, like feelings of relative deprivation and perceptions of the integration debate are highly relevant for Dutch society and should be studied further. Perceptions of the integration debate are influenced by the dominant reporting style in media, so this is an area not to be overlooked. The position of ethnic minorities of non-western descent in Dutch society, especially cultural aspects, has played an important role in the formation of parliament and continues to be problematized in the political arena (Fermin, 2009; Roggeband & Verloo, 2007). Moreover, the integration paradox is an indication that the often heard argument that the integration of ethnic minorities will be successful if they attain higher education might not be valid. Even though their (economic) position in society is better than the position of lower educated minorities, higher educated ethnic minorities feel less accepted, which is an important aspect of integration (Gijsberts & Vervoort, 2009)

The negative connotations attached to the labels used to describe ethnic minorities in the Netherlands could be related to similar theoretical processes as the integration paradox.

Identity construction is an important aspect of perceptions of relative deprivation, perceptions of the integration debate and labelling of ethnic minorities. The way ethnic minorities construct their identity, especially in relation to Dutch society, is connected to their perceptions of the way they are described in public debate of integration (Gijsberts & Vervoort, 2009) and the label used to describe minority groups will in turn affect their perceptions of the integration debate and their position in society (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2001).

The perceptions of ethnic minorities on these labels have not been studied thoroughly and need to be explored further. Additionally, Buijs et al. (2006) did not base the integration paradox on empirical findings; they merely postulated the existence of the phenomenon. Gijsberts and Vervoort (2009) qualitatively studied the phenomenon, although their interpretation is slightly different from Buijs et al., which will be described in the theoretical framework. Therefore, the aims of this paper are twofold. The first goal is to identify theoretical constructs and empirical findings from available literature that can be used to explain the integration paradox and the impact of labelling of ethnic groups. Second, to explore the integration paradox and perceptions of labelling of ethnic groups in a qualitative setting among higher educated Dutch ethnic minorities.

Therefore, in this paper, I will attempt to answer the following research question: How do younger, higher educated ethnic minorities in The Netherlands construct their identity and how do possible perceptions of relative deprivation and of the integration debate impact the identity construction process?

The structure in this paper is as follows: The main theoretical concepts will be described first, followed by the method used to collect and analyse the data, the results of the analysis and the discussion of the results. Background information on the participants of study, the

interviews conducted and translations of the quotes of participants can be found in the appendices.

Theoretical framework

This section will begin with a description of the history of integration in The Netherlands, its relation to the decrease of multiculturalism and the emergence of the integration debate. Secondly, social identity and Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), with a focus on social identity issues, will be discussed. Thereafter, the implications of the specific label allochthonous and autochthonous and the reclaiming of labels by minority groups in general will be discussed. Finally, the theory will be related to the integration paradox.

History of integration in The Netherlands

Pillarization was a Dutch tradition that gained momentum in the nineteenth century. Each religious or political group was allowed to create their own institutions (Vastra, 2007). Pillarization remained a daily reality until the end of the '70s, and the cultural diversity of the various groups in The Netherlands was not viewed as problematic during this time. The native Dutch were also split up in different groups and the non-western minorities were expected to return to their home countries. Policies aimed towards 'guest workers' were focused on ensuring equal opportunity in terms of socio-economic participation (Siebers, 2010), within their own state supported ethnic institutions, including media, healthcare and education. The policies were very ad hoc due to their expected limited duration. The government created a more coordinated policy towards minorities, which was in effect between 1980 and 1994. The aim of this policy was mutual adaption and emancipation of ethnic minorities with preservation of their cultural identity (Fermin, 2009).

Several criticisms of the policies were voiced, mostly regarding the changed relationship between citizen, the state, and the restructuring of the welfare system. In 1994, policies aimed towards minorities became more focused on citizenship (Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul, 2008; Fermin 2009). The state would help create a situation where minorities would be able to be self-reliant; however, the minorities also had a duty and responsibility to integrate into Dutch society. This change was reflected in the labels of the policies: The name of the policy changed from minority policy to integration policy (Fermin, 2009).

Another shift occurred when Paul Scheffer, a prominent politician, declared the multicultural society a failure in a much-discussed column entitled ‘The multicultural tragedy’ in 2000. Minority policies had already shifted from socio-economic participation to cultural integration (Fermin, 2009). Multiculturalism, the acceptance of cultural diversity, was in decline (Joppke, 2007), while policies and politicians became more focused on assimilation in terms of cultural values. The public debate of integration became more heated and potential problems were redefined as resulting from cultural conflict; especially the Islam was designated as a culprit. Several events have undoubtedly influenced the process, such as the terrorist attack on the World-Trade centre on September 11th 2001, the turbulent Dutch elections in 2002, with emergence and murder of Pim Fortyn⁴, and the murder of Theo Van Gogh⁵ in 2004 (Fermin, 2009).

Minorities were increasingly depicted in the public debate as a threat to Dutch culture. Geert Wilders¹, the party leader of the PVV², is famous for saying that he is not against Muslims, however he is against the Islam. His argument was that immigrants were not the

⁴ Pim Fortuyn was a flamboyant politician with strong anti-immigration sentiments who dubbed the Islam a ‘backwards’ culture (Demmers & Mehendale, 2010)

⁵ Theo van Gogh was a filmmaker and movie-personality, who was assassinated by a radicalized Dutch Muslim (Buijs et al., 2006; Demmers & Mehendale, 2010)

problem, it was the 'backward culture' they refused to part from. The media especially contrasted perceived constraints of the Islam against values depicted as Dutch like secularism, sexual liberty, individualism and acceptance of homosexuality (Demmers & Mehendale, 2010).

People living in The Netherlands acquire most information on policies, politics and events related to immigration and integration via media, so media are an essential area for the perceptions of the integration debate. It is safe to assume that their perceptions of this debate will echo in their personal discussions of integration. Perceptions of the public debate of integration are related to the construction of social identity of ethnic minorities living in The Netherlands, as the way the politics and the media discuss and treat a social ethnic group will impact the way they see themselves.

Social identity

Social identity refers to the aspects of an individual's self-definition related to the groups he or she belongs to. Social Identity Theory (SIT) implies that group membership is associated with positive or negative connotations and people prefer to view themselves and the groups they belong to positively rather than negatively (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This means that people, under most conditions, will evaluate ingroups more positively in comparison to outgroups. Intergroup comparison is an important factor for the evaluation of ingroups, and impacts upon the self-image of group members. Once this positive self-image has been established, it has to be maintained so people tend to differentiate ingroups from outgroups by identifying and constructing elements in which they evaluate their group as superior. Another strategy to maintain positive self-image is changing the values assigned to elements so that the comparison will be positive rather than negative (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tajfel,

1981). Even though SIT stems from the late '70s, it is still one of the most influential studies on social identity in the field of social psychology and considered relevant today (Blok, 2001).

Intergroup comparison is related to intergroup conflict, and is influenced by the perceptions of social mobility and social group status. Social group status is defined as “hierarchy of perceived prestige” (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p. 37) in which some groups are perceived as ‘superior’ and others as ‘subordinate’. ‘Subordinate’ groups are inclined to incorporate these evaluation of their group as worth less than the ‘superior’ group and consequently fail to establish a positive group identity, if the differences in social structure in the distribution of resources have been justified, legitimized and institutionalized by a mutually recognized status system. If the ‘subordinate’ groups question the characteristics associated with their lower status, they can attempt to construct a positive group identity. This can rekindle the conflict over resources and create tension between ‘superior’ and ‘subordinate’ groups (ibid.).

Resource related conflicts and tensions can have an adverse impact upon society. For instance, research has indicated that societies with higher income inequality have more social problems and these problems appear to encompass to the majority of the population. Examples of social problems are lack of trust, mental illness, violence, imprisonment, obesity, among others (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009). Feelings of relative deprivation result from group comparison and are influential in the construction of ingroup identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Intergroup conflict is often attributed to differences between groups and the larger the divide, the greater is the expectation of conflict. However, examination of studies on intergroup conflict indicate that the fiercest conflicts often involve groups who are very similar, or groups who are becoming more alike (Blok, 2001). This counterintuitive phenomenon can be clarified with the narcissism of minor difference, which implies that

groups who are similar can feel threatened by the similarity of the other groups when constructing their identity (ibid.). The establishment of positive self-image is threatened by this similarity; lack of difference can impede the possibility to positively contrast ingroups from outgroups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). An interesting example of this phenomenon can be found in Elias and Scotson (1965), where two working class groups who lived in neighbouring communities were involved in conflict. The only difference between the groups was the duration of residence. The group that constructed their identity as 'superior' had lived for two or three generations in the neighbourhood, while the groups that constructed their identity as 'subordinate' were new arrivals. So even though family history of residence was the only discernible difference between the groups, they constructed opposing identities and spoke in terms of 'us' versus 'them' (ibid.).

One of the ways in which 'superior' groups construct their identity as inherently more worthy is by stigmatizing the group that is perceived as 'subordinate'. This is achieved by ascribing qualities that represent the worst possible example of the group to all members of the 'subordinate' group, while ascribing the qualities that represent the best possible example to the 'superior' group. The 'subordinate' group often come to believe themselves that they are worth less than the 'superior' group (ibid.).

Some researchers argue that it is possible to reduce intergroup hostility and conflict by employing strategy of recategorization, where the identity constructions of group members are transformed from 'us' and 'them' into a more inclusive 'we'. This involves increasing the salience of superordinate level of social identity and decreasing the salience of the subgroup level (Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1996; Haslam, 2001). In this study, having Dutch nationality can be viewed as the superordinate level of identity and being autochthonous or allochthonous as subgroup levels. Other researchers advocate strategies from The Dual Identity Model, which entails expression and acknowledgement of both levels

of identity (Haslam, 2001; Huo, Smith, Tyler & Lind, 1996). The recategorization strategy can be compared to the assimilation model of integration, where the focus is on the decrease of cultural difference and The Dual Identity Model can be compared to the multicultural model of integration, where cultural diversity is viewed as an asset (Fermin, 2009; Joppke, 2009).

Labels used to describe ethnic groups

Although people have multiple social identities, and those identities are constantly negotiated and dependent on context, it is possible for one social identity to become dominant and accessible in most social situation. Verkuyten (2005) describes labels used to identify culturally diverse groups, who were first used as a political term and later on developed into social identity for a part of the group categorized by it. He gives the examples 'Hispanic' in The US and 'allochthonous' in The Netherlands. This label is an example of an ascribed identity, where people are grouped together on the bases of assumed shared features by others. This is different from self-ascription, where people define themselves in ethnic terms according to their own rules, norms and aims.

Labels like 'allochthonous' are a form of ascribed identity, but this does not mean that the recipients are passive. They themselves actively respond to unwanted and negative images. An example is the use of the derogatory term 'cunt-Moroccans' [Du.: *kut-Marokkanen*], which was used by a local politician in Amsterdam. However, when a rapper of Moroccan descent named Raymster created the song entitled '*kut-Marokkanen*', it quickly became very popular and the term was reclaimed by Moroccan youth, who started using it in a proud and defiant manner (Verkuyten, 2005). This was an example of an ascribed term becoming a self-ascribed one.

The implications of use of the labels allochthonous and autochthonous have been studied by Van der Haar and Yanow (2011), who performed an interpretative policy analysis. They conclude that even though the labels seem neutral because they refer to country of birth, the consequences of the use of the dichotomy are not neutral. The term has evolved from a scientific term to a label with exclusionary connotations (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011), that is frequently used by the autochthonous, as well as the allochthonous Dutch for categorization in everyday life (Verkuyten, 2005).

The term allochthonous was introduced by sociologist Hilda Verwey-Jonker in 1971, who conducted a study commissioned by the government on the different ethnic groups living in The Netherlands. Verwey-Jonker had originally entitled the study 'Migrants in The Netherlands' but was asked to change the title because the government did not want to be viewed as an immigration-society and wanted to emphasize that the 'guest workers' would not be staying permanently. Instead, Verwey-Jonker used the term allochthonous, which she had used in earlier research to describe native Dutch citizens who were born in a different city than where they currently resided (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011).

Although the term allochthonous has been used in policies since its introduction, the use became more common in the media since 2000 and CBS⁶ created a standard definition in 1999, which was adopted by the government. According to the definition, someone is allochthonous if they have at least one parent or grandparent born abroad (ibid.).

Besides the distinction native and non-native, the CBS also uses the taxonomy of western and non-western. Counter intuitively, this distinction does not refer to countries that are or are not geographically west of The Netherlands. Instead, the distinction is based on the similarity of allochthonous to autochthonous; If a group is strongly similar to the Dutch

⁶ CBS is the statistical bureau of government

population in terms of socio-economic and cultural aspects, they are considered western (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011). An example of this is the difference between categorization of immigrants from Indonesia and Surinam, both former colonies of The Netherlands. Surinamese immigrants are considered non-western and Indonesian immigrants are considered western, while Surinam is geographically located west of The Netherlands and Indonesia is located to the east. However, the immigrants from Indonesia are thought to be more similar to the autochthonous population than the Surinamese. It should be noted that many immigrants from Indonesia were repatriates, who were returning to The Netherlands and were white (ibid.).

In a way, the taxonomy indicates that western way of life is viewed as the norm and non-western lifestyles as deviating from the norm (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011). This also becomes apparent when one examines the governmental survey research on integration. The autochthonous population is not measured in these studies, which indicates that the assumption is made that they will not experience problems related to integration and can function as a point of reference for the allochthonous population (Schinkel, 2007).

Reclaiming labels

The example given of the Moroccan youth who constructed a new meaning to the ascribed identity of '*kut-Marokkanen*' (Verkuyten, 2005), is sometimes referred to as linguistic reclamation. This process entails the conscious utilization of a derogatory label by the group targeted by the label, frequently in an oppositional and positive sense (Brontsema, 2004). This is related to one of the strategies used for positive group identity construction; Changing the values assigned to elements so that the group comparison will be positive rather than negative.

Tajfel and Turner (1979, p. 43) give the example of “Black is beautiful” whereby the evaluation of the element skin colour is changed.

The use of labels, especially derogatory labels, can cause activation of stereotypes. The activation of stereotypes can depend on the perceivers of the labels (ingroup or outgroup status) and the label itself (descriptive or derogatory). This has been studied for the derogatory label “fag” and the more descriptive label “homosexual”. Ingroup members showed no higher activation of stereotypes when they were primed with “fag” than when they were primed with “homosexual”, in contrast to outgroup members (Carnagi & Maass, 2007). Therefore, it is possible that ethnic minorities in The Netherlands experienced the label allochthonous in a different manner than expected by politicians and researchers. These minorities mostly come in contact with the labelling of their group via the media, so this area is important for the way they experience labelling.

The integration paradox

The integration paradox was postulated by Buijs et al. (2006), who defined the phenomenon as “the more minorities are oriented towards Dutch society and have a higher motivation to integrate, the more they are vulnerable to intercultural conflict and exclusionary phenomenon.” (p. 202). Although not explicitly stated, this is described as a cause and effect relationship. Gijsberts and Vervoort (2009) operationalize orientation towards Dutch society and commitment to integration as the attainment of higher education, and study the influence of awareness on the Dutch media and politics and experience of relative deprivation on perceptions of acceptance and of discrimination in The Netherlands.

They concluded that higher educated ethnic minorities perceive occurrence of discrimination in The Netherlands as more frequent and experience a lower level of acceptance than lower educated minorities. They postulate that this finding can be explained by the experienced relative deprivation and higher awareness of the integration debate in media and politics (ibid.). The operationalization and the interpretation of causality can be questioned. The operationalization of orientation towards Dutch society and commitment to integration as attainment of higher education is slightly simplistic and not justified in the article. It is possible that not all higher educated ethnic minorities have a high motivation to integrate and are oriented to Dutch society. Additionally, the causality implied by both studies can be questioned. It is likely that perceptions of acceptance and discrimination impact upon motivation to integrate and orientation of Dutch society, and vice versa, so that these factors could be viewed as contributing instead of causal.

In summary, the integration debate and labelling used to categorize groups in The Netherlands, as depicted via the media, is expressed in opposing groups of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ and this opposition is likely to reverberate in the personal discussions of people. These discussions and perceptions will dynamically impact upon the construction of social identity. These concepts will be used to analyse the data, as will become apparent in the results section.

Method

In this section, the methodological background of the research approach will be introduced, followed by the interviewing method, the sample selection, participants and group composition. The section will end with a description of the analysis and some notes on the validity of the study and language issues inherent to translation.

Introduction

Grounded Theory was used as a methodological framework for the research procedure, as well as the analysis of transcripts resulting from the focus groups and interviews (Bryman, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1974; Strauss & Corbin, 1980). This implies that the number of a priori assumptions concerning factors that could influence the perceptions of participants on the integration debate and feelings of relative deprivation were minimized and no fixed hypotheses were formulated. Instead, literature research was used to identify a number of possible relevant factors and these were investigated in exploratory individual interviews. These interviews and the literature results were iteratively used to identify and formulate sensitizing concepts, which were used in the analysis of the interviews and the construction of discussion guides⁷. The data collection, analysis and literature research were also conducted in an iterative manner.

Grounded Theory was chosen as a framework because the research question centres around the effects of perceptions of media and societal relations on the construction of identity. The available empirical data on this area in The Netherlands is limited and qualitative research can be very useful in exploration of research subjects where it is unclear what the most important aspects are. Using semi-structured interviewing techniques instead of using structured interviewing or survey techniques allowed the participants to voice what they themselves find most important and decreased the impact of the preconceived notions of the researcher (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995).

Active interviewing

The interview participants in this study are viewed as active participants, who co-construct meaning in collaboration with the interviewer. This view is related to the linguistic turn,

⁷ See appendix A for the discussion guides.

which took place around the '70s. It entails the view that language is not a neutral medium, and is therefore critical towards the possibility of using interviews to gather objective knowledge on interviewees (Holstein & Gurbium, 1995). The linguistic turn embraces constructivism and interprets knowledge and meaning related to our view of reality as socially constructed. Knowledge is always produced by the steps taken to acquire it and should be assessed as a result of interaction (ibid.). Therefore, the unit of analysis in this project is interaction and not the answers of the participants stripped from context. This is another reason why Grounded Theory is viewed as an appropriate framework.

Sample selection

The participants were selected using purposive sampling, which is a non-probability form of sampling. There is no sampling frame available for younger, higher educated ethnic minorities in The Netherlands and generalization to population is not the goal of this project (Bryman, 2008). Instead the aim is to identify patterns by analysing utterances and relating patterns to the background of participants. This can lead to the identification of contextual factors that clarify why certain participants expressed a more negative attitude than other participants, or constructed their identity in a particular way. For this reason, the researcher attempted to maximize variation in contextual background factors, like ethnicity, gender and age⁸.

The ethnic background of the participants was considered an important background characteristic because different ethnic groups are depicted in different ways in the media. The other important demographic characteristics were age between 18 and 30 and higher educational status (university or vocational university level). Participants of this age group were chosen because younger adults active in higher education or recently graduated are

⁸ See appendix B for background information and numbering of participants.

preoccupied with future perspective and their identity in relation to the society at large. Therefore, they are more likely to have relevant thoughts on the subject of the study. The higher education status was important because the participants meet part of the requirements that are most commonly associated with integration and will probably have a different perspective on the integration debate than the lower educated. The participants were selected through the network of the University of Amsterdam (5), student organizations with ethnic theme (3) and the personal network of the researcher (4).

Participants and focus group composition

Seven semi-structured interviews and two focus groups were conducted for this research project between October and December of 2011, with twelve participants, in an informal setting with refreshments present. The first three interviews were exploratory interviews, as previously explained. The data from the exploratory interviews was used to further develop the discussion guide, which was used in two focus groups. Two participants from each focus group who's expressed utterances and background varied from the others in relation to the construction of social identity, were invited to participate in a follow-up interview. This interview allowed for more in-depth elaboration of the subject and gave the participants the possibility to express their thoughts without the presence of other ingroup members. The background information on participants in the three phases of the data collection process are described in table 1⁸.

The first focus group was conducted with 4 participants. Participant 7 was selected because of his general negative stance towards the Netherlands and the high importance he attributed to religion. Participant 6 was selected due to his positive stance towards The Netherlands and the fact that he lived in Surinam as well as the Netherlands. The second focus group was conducted with five participants. Participant 9 was selected because of her

explicit rejection of the Dutch identity and participant 12 was selected because of her reported frequent interactions with the autochthonous population.

Analysis

The interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim. The seven interviews lasted between 37 and 112 minutes, and the focus groups lasted 101 and 105 minutes. The transcripts⁹ were between 14 and 36 single-spaced pages in length, which resulted in 202 pages of transcripts.

All transcripts were coded in two phases: initial and selective coding. The initial phase entailed detailed coding whereby the researcher coded all relevant words and the selective coding phase was about the collection of the most common and revealing codes (Charman, 2006; Bryman, 2008). Constant comparison between the different cases was used to seek out deviant cases and deepen the understanding of the phenomenon. The coding was conducted using qualitative processing software Atlas.ti (Muhr, 1991) and focused on identifying patterns related to identity construction.

Validity and language

The validity of the results of this study was maximized by using peer review and a reflexive attitude by the researcher. The preliminary results of the coding and analysis were discussed with peers involved and not involved in the study, which can increase the theoretical validity of the study. Additionally, the researcher was very aware of preconceptions related to her critical standpoint towards the current situation in The Netherlands for ethnic minorities. Awareness of this possible source of bias was one of the reasons why semi-structured interviewing techniques were chosen (Johnson, 1997; Golafshani, 2003). Additionally, the

⁹ See appendix D for CD-ROM with interview transcripts.

thick description provided on the context of the study, the descriptions of the different phases in the data collection and analysis, the selected participants, data details and preconceptions of researcher all serve to increase the transparency of the research process (Yanow, 2009).

The interviews were conducted in Dutch and the quotes used in the result section were translated by the researcher to English. A native Dutch speaker, holding a PhD degree in English, was consulted to examine and increase the accuracy of the translation¹⁰, focusing on the feelings that the choice of words convey.

Results

The results of the analysis will be discussed in this chapter. The results are structured around the three sensitizing concepts as discussed in the theoretical framework: perceptions of the integration debate, perceptions and evaluations of labels used to describe ethnic groups and perceptions of the integration paradox. All results are related to the construction of social identity, which will be the focus of the result section.

Perceptions of the integration debate

The integration debate has been described to participants as all discussions in society on the subject of integration, including interpersonal discussions and discussions in the media and political arena. They were asked for their first association or thoughts on this debate, which lead to passionate conversation. The two focus groups showed different patterns of dominant speakers and followers, as is usual in focus groups.

¹⁰ See appendix C for translation of quotes.

The perceptions of the participants on politics were overwhelmingly negative. Most participants held a negative attitude towards politics and a negative evaluation of the rhetoric and policies aimed towards non-western minorities. Several participants expressed the belief that politicians and the policies towards ethnic minorities are aimed towards cultural assimilation, as can be seen in the following quote:

I personally think they uhm want to push the identity of the allochthonous citizen out and go back to the Dutch in itself. So really, the Dutch don't want that Moroccan-Dutch, they don't want that. They used to, but I have a feeling that this is changing. (9)⁸

This quote also exemplifies the belief that multiculturalism, which was described as the acceptance of cultural diversity (Joppke, 2007), is in decline. The rhetoric used was viewed as solely focusing on negative aspects of ethnic minorities. Wilders¹, is mentioned quite frequently as an example of polarizing rhetoric and is described as a politician whose only message is negativity towards ethnic minorities. Some participants mention frustration and disbelief that he has attracted so many votes last election, as is exemplified in the next quote:

I think it is really astounding that someone like Wilders comes to power and also, I am sure that more than half doesn't know what his policy is. It's really only, he hates allochthonous citizens, "that is why I am voting for him". (10)

Participants explain his success mainly by referring to the depiction of ethnic minorities in the media, and some relate his success to their perception of fear from native Dutch citizens that ethnic minorities will threaten the job availability among higher educated, as the following quote will illustrate:

[...] allochthonous citizens used to do the dirty jobs [...] People didn't mind that and now that we are becoming more educated, so I will take the job, the higher educated job and yeah, that bothers them. (9)

Some participants link this perception to their suspicion that ethnic minorities receive lower educational advice for secondary school than autochthonous Dutch and see this as a countermeasure employed by teachers in education to reduce the upward mobility of minorities.

Participants viewed media as polarizing and treating non-western minorities as different than the native Dutch. According to them, the ethnicity of the non-western suspects is frequently mentioned in crime reporting, while native Dutch suspects are described as “persons” instead of “Moroccan-Dutch” or “Muslim”. Furthermore, the media were described as placing emphasis on the ethnic aspect of identity in the case of negative reporting on ethnic minorities, whereas the Dutch aspect of the identity is emphasized when positive news is reported. The following quote is preceded with a description of Nasrdin Dchar, a Dutch actor of Moroccan descent who won a prestigious prize, which is mentioned in several interviews as an example:

[...] it's so annoying to see that if it's a foreigner¹¹, they mention the heritage and also skin-color [...] This makes it seem as if it's because of his heritage, as if it's because of those adjectives, like Islamic uhm [...] so if somebody commits a crime, it has to be mentioned, it states Surinamese-Dutch [...] because yeah, a native Dutch citizen wouldn't do something like that, but a Surinamese-Dutch citizen just might have done that. (12)

The allochthonous youngsters that are described in the media and these are always really very small group and even the slightest remark, or what have you, something is said, then it will immediately, it will be in the newspaper, in the media, all kinds of media and then it's indeed reported like a Turk or a Moroccan or something. And if something good happens, then the Turk or Moroccan will be removed and then it is just a youngster. (4)

These quotes illustrate that participants feel that positive behaviour and accomplishments are attributed to the Dutch aspect of their identity, while the negative behaviour is attributed to the ethnic aspect of the identity. All participants have expressed negative perceptions of the integration debate in the media, however, the interpretation on the reason for this is very different. Two participants interpreted the reason behind the stigmatization in media in very different ways, as the next quotes will illustrate:

¹¹ Foreigner was used to translate the Dutch word *buitenlander*. The denotations of both words are relatively similar, meaning someone who comes from a foreign country. However, the connotations of the word in Dutch are less negative than in English. For instance, allochthonous (*allochtoon*) is mentioned as a pejorative synonym of foreigner (*buitenlander*) in the Dutch language (Foreigner, 2010).

If you think about it more deeply and think well, yeah it's just logical that people say the positive things and not the negative things. I mean if parents have two children and one obtains a PhD, then they will proudly say my child has a PhD, but if the other is a criminal, then they won't express that. And if you think about it, it's completely logical. (6)

Media is mostly a psychological strategy of those in power [...] but media is not uhm the central power. Media is a means of those in power [...] I will give an example. In The Netherlands, uhm if one person would be killed by a Muslim, Muslims are also people, there all just people, uhm then the entire country will rebel. If literally dozens of Mosque's are burned down, that will not be reported in the media and Muslim women who are beaten with chains, an iron chain in the east of Amsterdam, yeah that will not be reported [...] And if it happens the other way around, than it has no influence whatsoever. So really it a means to influence our thinking. (7)

Participant 6 interprets the motivation behind the behaviour as neutral, and seems to view it as 'human nature' to distance oneself from people who could reflect negatively upon ourselves. Participant 7 views it as a means used by those in power to negatively influence worldviews of the Dutch population on allochthonous people. Evidently, participants perceived the integration debate, media as well as politics, as negatively stigmatizing their group and constructing a social reality of opposing social groups of 'us' versus 'them'. Interestingly, participants themselves also used this construction of social reality. When speaking about societal relations, some participants enveloped all ethnic minorities in the 'us' and contrasted them against the 'them' of the native Dutch or the Dutch politicians, as is exemplified in the following quote:

[...] if *they*, the politicians, if The Netherlands want to become better, economically, culturally, whatever, than *they* should stop the mudslinging [...] that will decrease *our* opportunities and make it more difficult for *us* (9) [emphasis added]

This quote followed after a discussion on the impact of the media and politics on the perception of the native Dutch on the ethnic minorities, so the 'they' refers to the Dutch and 'us' refers to ethnic minorities. This shows that the perceptions of the integration debate are related to the construction of social identity. Labelling is also associated to the construction of social identity and will be explored in the next section.

Labels to describe ethnic groups and identity construction

Many different subjects were discussed during the interviews and the labels spontaneously used to describe the group ethnic minorities by participants was mostly “foreigner”¹¹ [Du.: *buitenlander*] or “allochthonous citizen” [Du.: *allochtoon*]. When they spoke about the Dutch as a group, the participants used the label “Dutch citizen” [Du.: *Nederlander*]. The official meaning of the label Dutch citizen is someone with a Dutch passport, although the participants only used it to describe Dutch citizens who were white. The spontaneous use of these labels illustrate that the participants viewed the white Dutch citizens in opposition to the allochthonous population. The participants explicitly evaluated the label allochthonous as neutral and emphasized the original meaning as of foreign descent although the discussions of the integration debate made clear that they were aware of the negative connotations, as can be seen in the next quote:

[...] the word allochthonous has, there are a lot of associations, but I uhm, I don't mind the term. Because ultimately, it's only a descriptive term [...] which means someone who has at least one parent who's been born abroad. (3)

By emphasizing the original meaning, the participants could be reclaiming the label allochthonous and start using it as a self-ascribed identity instead of ascribed.

The participants were also explicitly asked to evaluate the labels proposed by Dutch politicians, namely “new Dutch citizen” [Du.: *nieuwe Nederlander*] and “bicultural” [Du.: *bicultureel*]. These labels were proposed as an alternative to allochthonous, as the politicians expected negative and exclusionary connotations. Most participants evaluated the proposed labels negatively and mentioned several objections. Firstly, participants commented on the perceived inaccuracy of the labels. Some participants indicated that they were not new in The Netherlands, so the label ‘new Dutch citizen’ was not accurate and ‘bicultural’ was criticized because not all ethnic minorities experience both cultures. Secondly, the participants

expressed the expectation that new labels would soon acquire the same negative connotations due to rhetoric used in media and politics. More importantly, some participants used the evaluation opportunity to reject the standpoint that being an autochthonous Dutch citizen is somehow better than being an allochthonous Dutch citizen, as is exemplified in the next quotes:

That sounds like a bunch of wannabees, I like allochthonous much better (9)

[...] new Dutch citizen sounds like Dutch is better. (5)

These quotes show that the participants do not appreciate the more inclusive nature of the proposed labels and prefer to be viewed as distinct from the autochthonous Dutch population. Likewise, the use of hyphenated identity, like Turkish-Dutch was generally not appreciated. This term was used by the interviewer in the first exploratory interview until the participant indicated that she preferred Dutch-Turkish, which has an emphasis on the Turkish aspect of nationality. When asked to describe themselves in terms of nationality, participants that used hyphenated identity all placed the emphasis on the non-Dutch aspect of their nationality. It seemed that the placing of emphasis was viewed as a way to prioritize group membership, as can be viewed in the following quote:

[...] I think that such an annoying word. Dutch-Somalian, Somalian-Dutch. No! [...] It's both a part of you [...] you are both. And they say, formally, you are supposed to say I am Somalian-Dutch, if you have the Dutch nationality but originate from Somalia. But no, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. (10)

The participant is expressing frustration because she probably feels pressured to prioritize the Dutch aspect of her identity over the ethnic part of her identity due to the assimilation rhetoric in the media and politics (Fermin, 2009). One participant avoided choosing to prioritize one over the other by stating she was Moroccan, as well as Dutch. Several participants mention that it would be best if there were no labels to make distinction between different groups in society because we are all basically human. The reactions to the labels can

be interpreted as an implicit plea for a multicultural society, where cultural diversity is viewed as an asset, instead of a liability (Joppke, 2007). In a way, participants are expressing the desire to be accepted as they are, instead of being considered acceptable if they conform to the Dutch culture and associated norms and values. This implicit plea is also related to the dilemma the participants experienced when constructing their identity.

Many participants felt that they were in crisis or dilemma when it came to their identity. They were not completely Dutch, nor could they ever become an autochthonous Dutch citizen. They also did not fully adhere to the cultural characteristics associated with the nationality of the country they or their family immigrated from because they possessed aspects of the 'European identity'. This dilemma becomes apparent in the following quote:

[...] it is very difficult because you are not Dutch, so you are in a conundrum. Also for ourselves, with our own culture, we aren't uhm completely, like, uhm Kurdish or completely Moroccan. You also have that European part, so you are in crisis [...] I am proud to be allochthonous, that I am not Dutch. I could never become Dutch, so I don't want to and if I am allochthonous, than I am just proud of that. (9)

The participants employed two strategies to deal with this dilemma: Emphasizing the similarity between the allochthonous and autochthonous population, or negatively contrasting the autochthonous population from the allochthonous population. Some participants described themselves as similar to autochthonous people of their own age and constructed their identity as similar to autochthonous Dutch. They stated that their white friends view them as completely the same, or indicated that they lived their life entirely the same as someone their age who is not allochthonous, and emphasized that they were similar to autochthonous Dutch in appearance. One participant described herself as Dutch, but most participants used hyphenated identity expression with emphasis on the ethnic aspect of their identity. A number of these participants also disputed that cultural norms and values, like "justice" and "reciprocity", were typically Dutch. Instead they argued that these were universal. These participants were trying to counter the stigmatization and the construction of

their group as 'subordinate', in comparison to the 'superior' autochthonous population, by disputing that values, which they consider positive, are inherently indicative of the autochthonous population.

The discrepancy between the explicit self-definition of most of these participants and their implicit identity construction as Dutch is interesting, and is exemplified in the next quote:

It's pretty bizarre that, I've I have not experienced discrimination, uhm yeah I mean, I just speak *ABN* [En.: received pronunciation], I study, I have a part-time job, I do everything that all regular younger people do, but I do describe myself as Dutch Turkish, you know, I am Turkish of course. (4)

This discrepancy can be interpreted in multiple ways. This could be viewed as another indicator of an implicit plea for multiculturalism. In addition, the participants could be constructing a new form of Dutch identity, whereby they identify with positive aspects attributed to autochthonous Dutch population, while still identifying with positive aspects they relate to the allochthonous population, as in the Dual Identity Model (Haslam, 2001; Huo, Smith, Tyler & Lind, 1996).

Other participants contrasted their identity with the autochthonous Dutch and identified with the allochthonous population or their religious affiliation. They dealt with the negative connotation associated with the allochthonous population by constructed a positive identity. They compared positive characteristics they associated with the allochthonous population with negative characteristics they associate with the autochthonous population (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), as can be viewed in the next quotes:

I saw a television program and I thought wow, I am so healthy! A bunch of Dutch students who went to Aruba, the only thing they did was boozing and using drugs, than I think that so different from my life. That is totally not how I live. I have never drunk a drop of alcohol, I have never taken drugs, never smoked and I never go out, like partying. I don't do that, so I think yeah, that's the complete opposite of Dutch students, at least how it appears to be in the University. (9)

I see, only when I look at my surroundings, many allochthonous who do really well [...] you hear that they go to the Mosque, they are becoming higher educated and they live a good life. (11)

These quotes illustrate that the participants counter the attribution of positive behaviour to Dutch aspects of identity and negative behaviour to the ethnic aspect of their identity they encounter in the media by reversing the process. Moreover, they reverse the process of stigmatization of their group as 'subordinate', by attributing the worst possible example of behaviour to all members of the 'superior' group. This also becomes apparent in their argument that the loitering allochthonous youth [Du.: *hangjongeren*], who are a popular topic in politics and media, exhibit negative behaviour because they are not higher educated, not because they are allochthonous. The result of the social categorization process is a construction of social reality in terms of opposing groups, whereby the allochthonous population is viewed in opposition to the autochthonous population, as became apparent in the section on social categorization in relation to the integration debate. One participant explicitly identified with the Islam and refused to describe his identity in terms of nationality. He constructed his identity as Muslim, which is exemplified in the next quote:

I don't see myself as Dutch, I also don't see myself as Turkish. I even don't see myself as a Kurd. I wouldn't associate myself with ethnic heritage [...] I believe uhm that I am Muslim [...] What's inside is important. I look at people the same way. I look at what he believes. Which values does he have? Is he humanist? Is he fascist? Is he communist? Is he socialist? I don't look, look like ow, he's blond. (7)

He established a positive self-image by comparing values and cultural aspects from the Islam to Dutch society (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). He is very critical of the values he calls secular and views this as a strategy of the government to reject all aspects related to the Islam and assimilate Muslims into the Dutch society. For instance, he compares legalized prostitution to slavery and contrasts this with the fact that polygamy is forbidden in The Netherlands, while men are free to choose to live with hundreds of women as long as they don't get married. Additionally, he attributes the negative behaviour of the loitering allochthonous youth to the

fact that they were raised in The Netherlands with Dutch values and also rejects the attribution of their behaviour to ethnicity.

Participant 7 seems to be the exception to the rule considering patterns of identity construction as he is the only one who does not identify with the allochthonous or autochthonous population. However, this can be clarified by looking at his background. He descended from Kurdish parents who raised him in Turkey and was in heightened crisis because he did not feel accepted in The Netherlands, nor did he feel that the Kurdish part of his heritage was respected in Turkey. This heightened crisis lead him to construct different boundaries in his social identity, related to religion instead of nationality or ethnicity. The two patterns related to identity construction play an important role in the perceptions of the integration paradox, as will become evident in the next section.

Perceptions related to the integration paradox

All participants expressed negative perceptions of the integration debate and most also expressed feelings of relative deprivation, but this did not appear to be directly related to their attitude towards the climate in The Netherlands. So, the explanatory factors found by Gijsberts and Vervoort (2009) did not operate as expected by the researchers in this situation. Additionally, the explanatory factors identified by Buijs et al. (2006), commitment to integrate and orientation to the Dutch society seemed to have a reversed relationship with perceptions of the climate in The Netherlands in this study. Participants who appeared less committed to integration and less oriented to the Dutch society, also had a more negative

The results of earlier research was not replicated in this study. This difference can be clarified by the construction of social identity employed by the participants. The participants

that expressed the most negative attitude towards the climate in The Netherlands contrasted their identity to the autochthonous population and constructed their identity as markedly different, while the participants who expressed a less negative attitude constructed their identity as similar to the autochthonous population. These two groups appeared to have several differences between them related to integration. Participants who constructed their identity as different reported having minimal informal contact with the autochthonous population because they preferred contact with people with whom they have more in common and frequently mentioned that they considered leaving The Netherlands once they completed their education, as can be viewed in the next quote:

I personally think, if it goes on like this, you know you have countries with a much better economy at the moment, than in The Netherlands and if, if the society keeps turning against the development of the allochthonous population, they will broaden their horizons and go elsewhere. (11)

This statement of independence can be interpreted as lessened orientation to the Dutch society and decreased motivation to integrate. These participants also expressed the belief that attaining higher education would make them financially independent of the Dutch government. The participants who construct their identity as similar to the autochthonous population seemed to be more committed to integration and more oriented to the Dutch society. They reported more contact with autochthonous population, were more positive about the opportunities for allochthonous citizens and pictured their future in The Netherlands.

The most important difference between the two groups can be found in their interpretation for the reasons behind the stigmatization in the media and instances of relative deprivation, as was described in the section on perceptions of the integration debate. Those who contrasted their identity with the autochthonous population interpreted the reasons negatively and mostly viewed it as stemming from malice, while those who constructed their

identity as similar to the autochthonous population interpreted the reasons more neutral and viewed it as caused by ‘human nature’. So, the way the participants experienced relative deprivation and negative perceptions of the integration debate was mediated by the construction of social identity. This difference in experience is caused by the need to establish positive self-image, as people tend to attribute behaviour from ingroup as positive, while interpreting behaviour from outgroups as negative (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, the attitude related to the climate in The Netherlands appeared to be caused by an interplay of the perceptions of relative deprivation, the integration debate and the construction of social identity.

Discussion

In this section, the research question will be answered, followed by discussion about the societal implications of the results, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

Research question

The research question of this study was: How do younger, higher educated ethnic minorities in The Netherlands construct their identity and how do possible perceptions of relative deprivation and of the integration debate impact the identity construction process? The most important finding of this study is that higher educated ethnic minorities construct their identities in two very different ways, either by contrasting their identity to the autochthonous population or by emphasizing the similarities. There appears to be very little nuances between these two positions; these strong opinions could be suggestive of the emotional investment of

the participants in what is clearly still a sensitive debate within Dutch society. These two dissimilar ways of identity construction are both reactions to perceived stigmatization of the allochthonous population in The Netherlands. Participants who emphasize similarities argue that the more positive characteristics associated with the 'superior' autochthonous population are also shared by the higher educated allochthonous population, and are therefore not 'subordinate'. The participants who contrast their identity to the autochthonous population argue that their group is not 'subordinate'; instead they generalize the worst behaviour they encountered of the 'superior' group to all group members and attempt to reverse the stigmatization process. This is in line with the earlier discussed study by Elias and Scotson (1965). The large difference between the ways in which the participants constructed their identity indicates that identity is a highly sensitive subject for them, that they experienced obstacles in establishing a positive self-image and utilized different strategies to construct such a positive self-image (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

The identity construction was also very influential for the perceptions of the integration debate and relative deprivation. The negative perceptions of the integration debate and reported feelings of relative deprivation were shared by most participants and did not appear to have a causal relation with the evaluation of the climate in The Netherlands. Instead, the two different types of identity construction functioned as an underlying mechanism impacting upon the attitudes of the participants.

The evaluation of the more politically correct labels proposed to identify the ethnic minorities were negative and did not vary considerably between participants with different social identity construction. The resistance to the labels with a more inclusive connotations seems be related to perceptions of politicians and policies as aiming to achieve cultural assimilation. The discussion on labels appears to indicate that the participants desired appreciation of the ethnic part of their identity, not just the aspect related to having Dutch

nationality. In other words, they want to be respected as they are, instead of gradually gaining respect as they assimilate into Dutch society and culture. Concluding, the reactions towards labels and two types of identity construction can be considered as an implicit plea for a multicultural society.

Societal implications

The results of this study have several implications for the Dutch society. First, attaining higher education is not sufficient to ensure integration of ethnic minorities. Attaining higher education does not necessarily lead to feelings of acceptance, which are an important aspect of integration. This could be related to the fact that higher educated minorities are probably more aware of their own minority status, because they are often surrounded by people of the majority group (autochthonous population), as is common in higher education. This unwanted effect could decrease as the number of ethnic minorities participating in higher education increases. However, if public perceptions of ethnic minorities remains negative and if the connotations of the autochthonous population of ethnic minorities do not include “is possibly educated”, increased participation will probably not change the situation. This all remains hypothetical until additional research can provide insight.

Second, even though the use of labels in policies and media are sometimes necessary to discuss certain subjects, it would be advisable to involve people of the group that is being labelled in the labelling process. Social categorization is related to the experience of labels and only people from a certain group can accurately predict reactions and perceptions to these labels. Moreover, many participants argued that, especially in crime reporting, it would be better to focus on people as individuals instead of as members of a specific group because

that tends increase polarization between the autochthonous population and allochthonous population.

Moreover, assimilation rhetoric is probably counterproductive to the aim of integration of ethnic minorities. These groups will probably resist the perceived pressure to conform to the Dutch culture and will most likely be less inclined to make an effort to participate fully in society. Assimilation rhetoric can potentially lead to unwanted effects, such as the higher educated ethnic minorities leaving The Netherlands once graduated. The assimilation strategy employed by some politicians, related to the recategorization strategy to reduce intergroup conflict, will probably bring about less positive results than The Dual Identity Model. This model allows for group members both identifying with their ethnic ingroup and the superordinate level of being Dutch (Haslam, 2001), so it has potential to transform the ‘us’ and ‘them’ to a more inclusive ‘we’.

Limitations of study and suggestions further research

Several limitations of this research project should be addressed. The relative low number of conducted interviews implies that the results of the study cannot be generalized to the entire allochthonous population. The results should be interpreted as substantive and cannot be used as formal theory because they are only applicable to a particular setting (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Additionally, the use of Grounded Theory as a research method entails iterative data collection and analysis, until no new information becomes apparent and theoretical saturation is achieved. Achieving complete saturation is often difficult due to subjectivity of the assessment and practical difficulties related to time constraints (ibid.), as was the case in this project. Nevertheless, it is believed that this study could be a helpful point of departure for

further research, which would both address the limitations of this study, as well as increase the understanding of the phenomenon.

This exploratory study has raised several questions and was successful in identifying several areas that warrant further investigation. First of all, the factors identified as causal by Buijs et al. (2006) and Gijsberts and Vervoort (2009) on the integration paradox could be contributing factors and should be studied further. Perceptions of relative deprivation and the integration debate probably impact feelings of acceptance and vice versa. However, the fact that the integration paradox was not apparent in the transcripts in this study does not mean that the phenomenon does not exist. It is inherently the case that this phenomenon can only be used to clarify differences between the lower and higher educated minorities and cannot be used to clarify relative differences within the group of higher educated. Additionally, the integration debate and rhetoric aimed at ethnic minorities shift over time (Vergeer, Lubbers & Scheepers, 2000), and it is possible that this is the reason why the integration paradox was not apparent in the findings. After all, many things have happened in this area in the last three years. Longitudinal research would be a pertinent strategy to assess the influence of time.

More importantly, the social categorization process should be investigated as a possible underlying mechanism of evaluation of the climate in Dutch society. Group comparison is an essential aspect of this process (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), so feelings of relative deprivation are probably important to the identity construction process. The results of this study appear to indicate that people who do not enclose the autochthonous population in their ingroup attribute situations they consider negative, like the integration debate, differently than people who do envelop the autochthonous population in their ingroup. The difference in attribution process could lead to the more negative evaluation of the situation in The Netherlands. People identify with various groups, so the situations in which the

allochthonous population identifies with the autochthonous population, along with the allochthonous population, ought to be the focus of further research in this area.

The labelling of ethnic groups is also an area that warrants further investigation. The labels studied in this study were evaluated very differently than expected on the bases of previous research (Van der Haar & Yanow, 2011). The relationship between the activation of stereotypes and use of labels is a particular pertinent area. It would be very interesting to see if there is a difference in activation of stereotypes when using the studied labels to categorize ethnic minorities by ingroup and outgroup members, as done for instance by Cargnaghi and Maass (2007) for labels related to homosexuality.

References

Blok, A. (2001). *Honour and violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration:

Multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review*

Sociology, 34, 153-179. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134608

Brontsema, R. (2004). A queer revolution: Reconceptualizing the debate over linguistic

reclamation. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, 17(1), 1-17. Retrieved from:

http://www.colorado.edu/ling/CRIL/Volume17_Issue1/paper_BRONTSEMA.pdf

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buijs, F. J., Demant, F., & Hamdy, A. (2006). *Strijders van eigen bodem: Radicale en*

democratische moslims. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Cargnaghi, A., & Maass, A. (2007). Ingroup and outgroup perspectives in the use of derogatory group labels: Gay versus Fag. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 142-156. doi: 10.1177/0261927X07300077

Demmers, J., & Mehendale, S. S. (2010). Neoliberal xenophobia: The Dutch case.

Alternatives, 35, 53-70. doi:10.1177/030437541003500103

Elias, N., & Scotson, J. L. (1965). *The established and the outsiders*. London: Frank Glass and Co. Ltd.

Fermin, A. (2009). Burgerschap en multiculturaliteit in the Nederlandse integratiebeleid.

Beleid en maatschappij, 36(1), 13-27. Retrieved from: http://www.boomlemmatijdschriften.nl/tijdschrift/benm/2009/1/benm_2009_036_001_003

Foreigner (2010). *Van Dale online*. Retrieved January 26, 2012 from: <http://surfdiensten3.vandale.nl/vandale/zoekservice/?type=pro>

Gaertner, S. L., Rust, M. C., Dovidio, J. F., Bachman, B. A., & Anastasio, P. A. (1994). The contact hypothesis: The role of common group identity on reducing intergroup bias.

Small Group Research, 25(2), 224-229. doi: 10.1177/1046496494252005

Gay, C. (2004). Putting Race in Context: Identifying the Environmental Determinants of Black Racial Attitudes. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4), 547-562. doi:

10.1017/S0003055404041346

Gijsberts, M., & Vervoort, M. (2004). Concentratie en wederzijdse beeldvorming tussen autochtonen en allochtonen. *Migrantenstudies*, 20(3), 145-168. Retrieved from:

<http://www.migrantenstudies.nl/wp-content/uploads/MS-2004-NR3-P145-168.pdf>

Gijsberts, M., & Vervoort, M. (2009). Beeldvorming onder hoger opgeleiden:

Waarom is er sprake van een integratieparadox? *Sociologie*, 5(3), 406-429. Retrieved

from: http://www.boomlemmatijdschriften.nl/tijdschrift/sociologie/2009/3/Sociologie_2009_005_003_005.pdf

Glaser, G. B., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-607. Retrieved from: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf>

Hankel, A. (2010, May 8). ChristenUnie: Noem allochtoon liever bicultureel burger. *Elsevier*. Retrieved October 10, 2011 from: <http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Politiek/265121/ChristenUnie-Noem-allochtoon-liever-biculturele-burger.htm#>

Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in Organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage Publications.

Holstein, J. A., & Gurbium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separatism the Problem? Is assimilation the answer? *Psychological Science*, 7(1), 40-45. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00664.x

Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the validity structure in qualitative research. *Education*,

118(2), 282-292. Retrieved from: <http://www.dralessandro.com/subpages/PDFfiles/Validit y%20Structure.pdf>

Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1080/01402380601019613

Langelaar, J. (2011, June 29). PVV: Ook derde generatie allochtoon noemen. *Elsevier*.

Retrieved October 19, 2011 from: <http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Politiek/301202/PVV-Ook-derde-generatie-immigrant-allochtoon-noemen.htm>

301202/PVV- Ook-derde-generatie-immigrant-allochtoon-noemen.htm

301202/PVV- Ook-derde-generatie-immigrant-allochtoon-noemen.htm

Muhr, T. (1991). ATLAS/ti- A prototype for the support of text interpretation. *Qualitative*

Sociology, 14(4), 349-371. doi:10.1007/BF00989645

PVV wil definitie allochtoon oprekken (2011, June 29). *Nu.nl*. Retrieved October 19, 2011

from: [http://www.nu.nl/politiek/2551779/pvv-wil-definitie-allochtoon-](http://www.nu.nl/politiek/2551779/pvv-wil-definitie-allochtoon-oprekken.html)

[oprekken.html](http://www.nu.nl/politiek/2551779/pvv-wil-definitie-allochtoon-oprekken.html)

Roggeband, C., & Vliegthart, R. (2007). Divergent framing: The public debate on

migration in the Dutch parliament and media, 1995-2004. *West European Politics*, 30

(3), 524-548. doi:10.1080/01402380701276352

Roggeband, C. & Verloo, M. (2007). Dutch women are liberated, migrant women are a

problem: The evolution of policy frames on gender and migration, 1995-2005. *Social*

Policy and Administration, 41(3), 271-288. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9515.2007.00552.x

- Schinkel, W. (2007). *Denken in een tijd van sociale hypochondrie: Aanzet tot een theorie voorbij de maatschappij*. Kampen: Klement.
- Siebers, H. (2010). The impact of migrant-hostile discourse in the media and politics on racioethnic closure in career development in the Netherlands. *International Sociology*, 25(4), 475-500. doi: 10.1177/0268580909351322
- Sizemore, D. S., & Milner, W. T. (2004). Hispanic Media Use and Perceptions of Discrimination: Reconsidering Ethnicity, Politics, and Socioeconomics. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45(4), 765-748. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2004.tb02313.x
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1980). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Tweede kamer (2009). Gemeenschappelijke integratieagenda: Datgene wat ons bindt, 32268, nr. 8. Retrieved from: <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/brochures/2009/01/01/datgene-wat-ons-bindt-gemeenschappelijke-integratieagenda.html>
- Van der Haar, M., & Yanow, D. (2011). Allochtoon as metafoor en categorie: Over

implicaties van beleidstaal. *Beleid en Maatschappij*, 38(2), 160-178. Retrieved from:
http://www.boomlemmatijdschriften.nl/tijdschrift/benm/2011/2/benm_1389-0069_2011_038_002_003

Van der Waal, J., De Koster, W., & Achterberg, P. (2011). Stedelijke context en steun voor de PVV: Interetnische nabijheid, economische kansen en cultureel klimaat in 50 Nederlandse steden. *Res Publica*, 2, 189-207. Retrieved from: http://repub.eur.nl/res/pub/26141/Van%20der%20Waal_etal_2011_Stedelijke%20context%20en%20steun%20voor%20de%20PVV.pdf

Vastra, E. (2007). From ethnic minorities to ethnic majority policy: Multiculturalism and the shift to assimilationism in The Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(5), 713-740. doi: 10.1080/01419870701491770

Vergeer, M., Lubbers, M., & Scheepers, P. (2000). Exposure to newspapers and attitudes toward ethnic minorities: A longitudinal analysis. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 11(2), 127-143. Retrieved from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/106461700246661>

Verkuyten, M. (2005). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. Sussex: Psychology Press.

Wilders, G. (2009). Bijdrage Wilders prinsjesdebat. Retrieved January 25, 2012 from: <http://www.watwilwilders.nl/Wildersbeledigtgroepen.html>

Wilkinson, R. G., & Pickett, K. E. (2009). Income inequality and social dysfunction. *Annual*

Review Sociology, 35, 493-511. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115926

Yanow, D. (2009). Dear author, dear reader: The third hermeneutics in writing and reviewing

Ethnography. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political ethnography* (pp. 275-302). Chicago, IL:

University of Chicago Press.

Appendix A

Discussion guide introductory interviews

Introduction, interpretation

- Anna Berbers
- UvA student, interested in integration debate (media as well as personal conversations) and how this relates to how you see yourself.
- Introduce yourself: Name, origin (where are your mom and dad from?), age and what do you do in everyday life?

Perception integration debate

- If I mention the integration debate, what is the first thing that comes to mind?
- Do you follow the integration debate?
- If so, from what sources? TV or newspapers? What programs/newspapers do you find pleasant to follow? Which do you dislike?
- Do you feel involved in the news? Or do you follow the news more as an obligation?
- Do you talk with people in your surroundings on integration issues? Who? Family, friends, colleagues, acquaintances? What do you talk about? Can you describe a situation? What kind of background your interlocutors have?
- Who would you not want to talk to about integration? Why not these people?
- Who would you want to talk to about integration, that you do not talk to now? Why?
- Do you think that certain groups in the Netherlands are described more negative than others? If so, what?
- What do you think about how your own group is discussed?

- Do you feel personally addressed when someone with your background is depicted negatively in the news?
- Which aspects do you think are highlighted of people with your background? Positive and negative aspects?
- Follow you ever get news from abroad? Do you prefer this over Dutch news? Why?

How do you see yourself in the society (identity and relative deprivation)

- What do you mean by someone who is typically Dutch? If you had to paint a picture, what would it look like?
- Do you consider yourself Dutch?
- If not, how do you see yourself?
- Do you feel disadvantaged compared to native Dutch? Can you give an example?
- Do you ever felt excluded from Dutch society? Can you give an example?
- What is it like to live in the Netherlands as a Dutch immigrant? How do you think this will develop in the future?
- Do you ever experience discrimination in your daily life? Can you give an example?
How has this affected your thinking about your place in society?
- What does it mean for you to be a Dutch citizen?
- Do you also feel like a typical inhabitant of Amsterdam [Du.: *een echte Amsterdammer*]?
- How proud are you of your lineage?
- Does heritage have a big effect on your life? Does religion have a big effect on your life? In what way?

- Suppose you had to divide the Netherlands in different groups, which groups would you choose? Why these groups? Why, based on these characteristics?

Language /perceptions

- What is the first thing that comes to mind when I mention integration? What do you mean by integration?
- What is the first thing that comes to mind when I mention allochthonous? What do you mean by allochthonous?
- What do you think of the word 'new Dutch citizen' [Du.: *nieuwe Nederlander*]?
- What do you think the term 'bicultural' [Du.: *biculturee*]?
- If you could choose one word, what word would it be? Why?

Integration paradox

- Study which shows that higher educated, non-western minorities have a more negative opinion about the Netherlands than less educated minorities.
- Do you recognize the finding?
- If so, why do you think this is so?
- Do you talk sometimes with other higher educated immigrants on society integration issues and natives?
- Do you ever talk to other people about society and integration issues?
- If so, where you talk about? Can you describe an example?

Wrap up

- Is there something I did not ask what you think is important?
- Thank you for your participation!
- The interview is now finished. What did you think?

Discussion guide focus groups

Introduction, interpretation

- Anna Berbers
- UvA student, interested in integration debate (media as well as personal conversations) and how this relates to how you see yourself.
- Introduce yourself: Name, origin (where are your mom and dad from?), age and what do you do in everyday life?

Perception integration debate

- First association.
- Talking to people (Mauro, employment agencies, incidents in politics).
- Representations in the integration debate.
- Foreign News

How do you see yourself in the society (identity and relative deprivation)

- Dutch citizen

- Society.
 - Discrimination (of others people?, explanation of difference between personal and discrimination experienced by others?).
 - Religion.
 - Groups Netherlands.
 - Future perspective (country).
-
- *Language/perceptions*
 - Allochthonous.
 - Other labels?

Integration paradox

- Study which shows that higher educated, non-western minorities have a more negative opinion about the Netherlands than less educated minorities. (Other people? explanation of difference between personal interpretation and interpretation by others?)

Wrap up

- Is there something I did not ask what you think is important?
- Thank you for your participation!
- The interview is now finished. What did you think?

Discussion guide follow-up K (2)

Introduction

- Aim of the interview (elaborate on some aspects for which there was no time in the focus group)
- I am mostly looking for stories of things you or your family and friends have experienced.

Integration debate

- Recognition of the stories of parents and grandma (Parents left when K was 8 because “they didn’t feel like staying”)
- New and old way of integration (old way was to integrate minorities in villages)
 - Social pressure
- Melting of cultures (marriages etc.), desirable?
 - Balance integration
- Visibility, negative representation in the news, provisions to preserve cultural heritage
- Integration paradox: 2 answers in the discussion (more integrated, so more freedom, less pressure, so lower educated, and higher educated so broadened horizon)
- Share idea behind integration policies with ethnic minorities.

Speakers communities

- Clustering of groups: loitering youth and black schools
- Difference speaking sorority and student association
- Stories? For instance spoke about Mauro?

Identity

- Knowing versus recognition of student association
 - Visibility
 - “Muslim association are all perfectly recognized”
- “You are everything”: story of nice conversation with friend
 - Hindu
 - Surinamese: difference?
 - Dutch
- Paki: During first week of university they called you “Paki” because they couldn’t pronounce your name. What did you think when this happened?
- Stories about discrimination
 - Possibly of friends
- Future in The Netherlands or in Surinam

Discussion guide follow-up H (7)

Introduction

- Aim of the interview (elaborate on some aspects for which there was no time in the focus group)
- I am mostly looking for stories of things you or your family and friends have experienced.

Icebreaker: can you tell me something about your job as a hallal-inspector?

Integration debate

- The others versus the secularists: The people who are viewed as different by the secularists
 - VVD, PVV and a part of the CDA voters
- Words who have helped bring about a uncivilized integration process: 11/9, first gulf war, second war in Iraq
- Integration paradox: people who a higher educated know more about history, so view The Netherlands and Dutch people more negatively.
 - Other reasons why higher educated people of ethnic origins have a more negative attitude?
- Melting of cultures not possible. Why?
 - Prostitution versus polygamy
 - Counterproductive effects of integration: not voluntary

Speaker communities

- Stories about conversations on integration, Mauro for instance? Different if you speak to different people?
- Dutch friends?
- Dutch brothers who have changed religion to the Islam

Identity

- Identification with your ethnicity or appearance: je identify with what's inside, with what you believe
 - Socialist, humanist, Muslim
- Kurd
- Turk
- Stories about discrimination
 - Possibly of friends
- Originally Kurdish, you have roots in Turkey and in The Netherlands. Where do you see your future?

Discussion guide follow-up S (9)

Introduction

- Aim of the interview (elaborate on some aspects for which there was no time in the focus group)
- I am mostly looking for stories of things you or your family and friends have experienced.

Integration debate

- Disconnection politics and integration debate
 - Quote 1: I personally think they want to push the identity of the allochthonous citizen out and go back to the Dutch in itself. So really, the Dutch don't want that Moroccan-Dutch [...] They used to, but I have a feeling that this is changing and yeah, that's not going to happen.

- Quote 2: Yeah, that's what I am trying to say, that they are trying to accomplish it, but it's incompatible with what is actually going on in society.
- Current situation immigrants in the Netherlands: you have described it as a phase (more higher educated immigrants, better jobs and more participation in society).
How do you think this will develop?
- In the focus group, it became apparent that ethnic minorities who do something good are depicted as being Dutch, while ethnic minorities who do something bad are depicted as being foreigners in the media. Why do you think this is?
- Voting for Wilders: Higher educated people vote for him too. Why? Connection with possible feelings of power and fear? Can you tell me something more about this?
- Integration paradox: higher educated, less dependent on the government (money, grants) and more awareness of the integration debate, so more negative about Dutch society? Do I understand it fully? Something to add?

Speaker communities

- Stories about conversations on integration, Mauro for instance? Different if you speak to different people?
- Dutch friends? Dutch friend, who later on appeared to be half Chinese. No Dutch friends. What do you think about this?

Identity

- Identity: you make all kinds of circles (foreigner, Kurd, belong to that family).
 - Can you tell me a little bit more about the circles you belong to?
- Identity Dutch? Thoroughbred Dutch (no parents of other European country), can you tell me why you think that people who are raised in The Netherlands are only Dutch if both parents were born in The Netherlands as well?
- Identity Dutch: only if someone is thoroughbred Dutch and feels Dutch. After this comment, there was a lively debate and I couldn't understand a part of the recording. Can you tell me a little more about it?
- You told me about a conversation about a girl from Surinam and you asked where she was from and she said I am Dutch. I thought you had a negative reaction to her statement. Can you tell me something more about it?
- You preferred the word allochthonous over 'new Dutch citizen and 'bicultural' and you said that other have a negative connotation of allochthonous, but you yourself a positive one (contents and mark). Can you tell me something more about it?

Discussion guide follow-up R (12)

Introduction

- Aim of the interview (elaborate on some aspects for which there was no time in the focus group)
- I am mostly looking for stories of things you or your family and friends have experienced.

Integration debate

- Integration debate: first association Dutch language. Can you tell me a little more about it?
- Depiction ethnic identity in crime reporting: the mentioning the ethnicity makes it seem as if it is because of heritage (causal factor). Can you tell me a little more about it?
- Allochthonous who are studying in the library are Dutch all of a sudden.
- Future perspective allochthonous population in The Netherlands: how will this evolve?
- Broadening of horizon Dutch. Context: people in Limburg [rural area] have voted a lot for the PVV, but live in neighbourhoods with relatively few allochthonous. How do you think this works?
- Etos-feeling/discrimination. Have you ever experienced this? Can you tell me a little more about it?
- Which factors do you think play a role in discrimination/ the current situation in the society for the allochthonous population?
- While school and Dutch friends:
 - They say to you: “you are just like us Dutch, you are normal. Why do you think they say this to you?
- Integration paradox: is connected to (in)security. Higher educated minorities are more secure because of their education. Can you tell me a little more about it?
 - Do you think there are any other factors?

Speaker communities

- Do you talk with your friends about issues related to integration?

- Do you notice a difference when you speak with your White or allochthonous friends?

Identity

- How would you describe yourself in terms of ethnicity?
- Integration processes and adaption: do you think Dutch Muslims are asked to adapt to the way things are in Dutch society? Mutual?
- Future perspective? Different country than The Netherlands?
- Do you feel at home/accepted?

Appendix B

Table 1

Background information of participants

Identification number	Gender	Age	Ethnic background	Participated in:
1	Female	25	Turkish	Exploratory interview
2	Male	22	Dutch (white) and Dutch-Antilles	Exploratory interview
3	Male	26	Turkish	Exploratory interview
4	Female	24	Turkish	Focus group (1)
5	Female	19	Dutch (white) adoptive parents and Chinese heritage	Focus group (1)
6	Male	20	Surinamese	Focus group (1) and depth-interview
7	Male	25	Kurdish	Focus group (1) and depth-interview
8	Female	18	Dutch (white) and Dutch-Antilles	Focus group (2)
9	Female	23	Kurdish	Focus group (2) and depth-interview
10	Female	18	Iraqi	Focus group (2)
11	Female	20	Somali	Focus group (2)
12	Female	18	Moroccan	Focus group (2) and depth-interview

Note: Six participants were born in The Netherlands, four immigrated during childhood and 1 immigrated a couple of years ago. This information will not be related to the other background information due to anonymity issues.

Appendix C

Translation quotes

I personally think they uhm want to push the identity of the allochthonous citizen out and go back to the Dutch in itself. So really, the Dutch don't want that Moroccan-Dutch, they don't want that. They used to, but I have a feeling that this is changing. (9)

Ik denk persoonlijk dat ze ehm de identiteit van allochtoon zelf opzij willen schuiven en naar de Nederlander op zich willen ja, dus eigenlijk Nederlanders willen niet dat Marokkaans-Nederlandse, dat willen ze niet. Dat wilden ze wel, maar ik heb ook het gevoel dat het steeds meer naar de andere kant toegaat. (9)

I think it is really astounding that someone like Wilders comes to power and also, I am sure that more than half doesn't know what his policy is. It's really only, he hates allochthonous citizens, that is why I am voting for him. (10)

Wat ik ook echt verbazingwekkend vind is dat een type als Wilders dan aan de macht komt en dat ook, ik weet zeker dat meer dan de helft niet weet wat zijn beleid is. Het is echt puur, hij haat allochtonen, dat is waarom ik op hem stem. (10)

[...] allochthonous citizens used to do the dirty jobs [...] People didn't mind that and now that we are becoming more educated, so I will take the job, the higher educated job and yeah, that bothers them. (9)

[...] in het begin was het zo, allochtonen deden het vuile werk [...] Daar zat men niet mee en nu zijn we steeds hoger opgeleid dus ik pik de baantjes in, nou hoogopgeleiden baantjes en ja, dan dat stoort ze. (9)

[...] it's so annoying to see that if it's a foreigner, they mention the heritage and also skin-color [...] This makes it seem as if it's because of his heritage, as if it's because of those adjectives, like Islamic uhm [...] so if somebody commits a crime, it has to be m-mentioned, it states Surinamese-Dutch [...] because yeah, a native Dutch citizen wouldn't do something like that, but a Surinamese-Dutch citizen just might have done that. (12)

[...] het is ook heel vervelend om te zien dat als het een buitenlander is wordt meteen afkomst vermeld en ook de kleur [...] Dan lijkt het als of het als of het door zijn afkomst, of alsof het door die bijvoeglijke naamwoorden, Islamitisch ehm [...] dus als iemand een misdaad heeft begaan, ja dan moet er wel v- vermeld worden, er staat Surinaamse Nederlander [...] want ja een Nederlander die doet dat soort dingen niet, maar een Surinaamse-Nederlander, ja die kan het misschien nog wel hebben gedaan. (12)

The allochthonous youngsters that are described in the media and these are always really very small group and even the slightest remark, or what have you, something is said, than it will immediately, it will be in the newspaper, in the media, all kinds of media and then it's indeed reported like a Turk or a Moroccan or something. And if something good happens, than the Turk of Moroccan will be removed and then it is just a youngster. (4)

De allochtonen jongeren die in beeld komen en het zijn dan zulke echt heel klein groepje altijd en die worden dan als er ook maar een iets is, wat ze, iets wat er geroepen of of weet ik veel, er wordt iets gezegd, gelijk wordt dat in een krant, in de media of allerlei soorten media wordt het behandeld en gelijk wordt er dan een inderdaad neergezet van dan is het gelijk een Turk of een Marokkaan of iets. En als er iets goeds gebeurd is, dan wordt het Turk of Marokkaan weggehaald en dan is het gewoon een jongere. (4)

[...] if *they*, the politicians, if The Netherlands want to become better, economically, culturally, whatever, than *they* should stop the mudslinging [...] that will decrease *our* opportunities and make it more difficult for *us* (9) [emphasis added]

[...] als zij, als zeg maar, de politiek, als Nederland verder wil, beter wil worden, economisch gezien, cultureel gezien, maakt niet uit, dan moeten zij ons niet zwartmaken [...] dan hebben wij minder kans en wordt het voor ons moeilijker (9)
[nadruk toegevoegd]

[...] the word allochthonous has, there are a lot of associations, but I uhm, I don't mind the term. Because ultimately, it's only a descriptive term [...] which means someone who has at least one parent who's been born abroad. (3)

[...] het woord allochtoon heeft, er hangen heel veel associaties aan maar ik vind de term zelf ehm per se niet erg ofzo. Want uiteindelijk is het gewoon een beschrijvende term en die volgens mij [...] heet iemand waarbij één ouder in het buitenland is geboren.

That sounds like a bunch of wannabees, I like allochthonous much better (9)

Dat klinkt als een stelletje wannabees ik vind allochtoon veel fijner hoor.

[...] new Dutch citizen sounds like Dutch is better. (5)

[...] nieuwe Nederlander lijkt het alsof Nederland beter is.

[...] I think that such an annoying word. Dutch-Somalian, Somalian-Dutch. No! [...]

It's both a part of you [...] you are both. And they say, formally, you are supposed to

say I am Somalian-Dutch, if you have the Dutch nationality but originate from

Somalia. But no, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. (10)

[...] ik echt zo'n vervelend woord. Nederlands-Somalisch, Somalisch-Nederlandser,

Nee! [...] het allebei hoort bij jou [...] je bent het allebei. En dan zeggen ze wel, for-

formeel zeg je dan, ik ben een Somalische-Nederlander, maar als je dan de

Nederlandse nationaliteit hebt, maar je komt uit Somalië. Maar nee, het boeit niet.

Het boeit niet.

[...] it is very difficult because you are not Dutch, so you are in a conundrum. Also

for ourselves, with our own culture, we aren't uhm completely, like, uhm Kurdish or

completely Moroccan. You also have that-, that European part, so you are in crisis [...]

I am proud to be allochthonous, that I am not Dutch. I could never become Dutch, so I

don't want to and if I am allochthonous, than I am just proud of that. (9)

[...] het is ook heel dubbel want aan de andere kant ben je ook geen Nederlander dus verkeer je weer in een dilemma. Ook voor onszelf, met onze eigen cultuur zijn we ook niet helemaal ehm zeg maar ehm Koerdisch of helemaal Marokkaans. Je bent ook weer dat-, de Europeaan naast-, dus je verkeerd dus een beetje in een crisis [...] ik ben er trots op dat ik allochtoon ben, dat ik geen Nederlander ben, ik zou ook nooit een Nederlander kunnen worden dus ik wil het ook niet worden en als ik dan allochtoon ben dan ben ik daar gewoon trots op. (9)

It's pretty bizarre that, I've I have not experienced discrimination, uhm uhm yeah I mean, I just speak ABN [received pronunciation], I study, I have a part-time job, I do everything so that all regular younger people do, but I do describe myself as Dutch Turkish, you know, I am Turkish of course. (4)

En het is best wel bizar dat je, ik heb ik heb zelf niet met discriminatie te maken, ik heb ehm ehm ja ik bedoel, ik praat gewoon ABN Nederlands, ik studeer, ik heb een bijbaan, ik doe gewoon alles wat ja wat elk jongeren gewoon doet, maar ik zeg wel van ik ben een een Nederlandse Turk weet je, ik ben wel gewoon Turks. (4)

I saw a television program and I thought wow, I am so healthy! A bunch of Dutch students who went to Aruba, the only thing they did was boozing and using drugs, than I think that so different from my life. That is totally not how I live. I have never drunk a drop of alcohol, I have never taken drugs, never smoked and I never go out, like partying. I don't do that, so I think yeah, that's the complete opposite of Dutch students, at least how it appears to be in the University. (9)

Ik zag laatst een programma op tv en ik dacht wow, wat ben ik gezond! Allemaal Nederlandse studenten die naar Aruba gingen, het enige wat ze deden was zuipen en drugs gebruiken, dan denk ik van dat staat zo ver van mijn bed. Het is totaal niet hoe ik leef. Ik heb nooit een druppel alcohol gehad, ik heb nooit iets van drugs genomen, nooit gerookt en ehm ik ga ook nooit uit, he dus nachttuit. Dat doe ik niet en dan denk ik van ja, dat is het omgekeerde van Nederlandse student, tenminste tot zover ik het allemaal zie op de Uni. (9)

I see, only when I look at my surroundings, many allochthonous who do really well [...] you hear that they go to the Mosque, they are becoming higher educated and they live a good life. (11)

Ik zie alleen als ik naar mijn omgeving kijk veel allochtonen, die doen het hartstikke goed, en dan de jongens die dan, die dan, je hoort ze later dat ze naar de Moskee zijn gegaan, dat ze steeds meer hoger opgeleid worden, dat ze nu een goed leven lijden. (11)

I totally don't see myself as Dutch, I also don't see myself as Turkish. I even don't see myself as a Kurd. I wouldn't associate myself with ethnic heritage [...] I believe uhm that I am Muslim [...] What's inside is important. I look at people the same way. What does he believe? Which values does he have? Is he humanist? Is he fascist? Is he communist? Is he socialist? I don't look, look like ow, he's blond. (7)

Ik zie mezelf helemaal niet als Nederlander, ik zie mezelf ook niet als een Turk. Ik zie mezelf niet als een Koerd zelfs. Ik zou mezelf associëren met etnische oorsprong.

Ik geloof ehm dat ik Moslim ben [...] Wat van binnen zit is belangrijk. Zo kijk ik ook naar de mens. Waar gelooft hij in? Welke waarde heeft hij? Is hij een humanist? Is hij fascist? Is hij communist? Is hij socialist? Ik kijk niet, ow hij is blond. (7)

If you think about it more deeply and think well, yeah it's just logical that people say the positive things and not the negative things. I mean if parents have two children and one obtains a PHD, then they will proudly say my child has a PHD, but if the other is a criminal, then they won't express that. And if you think about it, it's completely logical. (6)

Als je gewoon even doordenkt en denkt van nou ja, het is gewoon logisch dat mensen de positieve dingen gaan zeggen en niet de negatieve dingen. Ik bedoel als ouders 2 kinderen hebben en ene promoveert, dan gaan ze heel trots zeggen van ja de mijne promoveert, maar als er eentje crimineel is dan gaan ze dat natuurlijk niet meer zo uiten. En als je dan zo bedenkt dan is het gewoon logisch dat het zo is. (6)

Media is mostly a psychological strategy of those in power [...] but media is not uhm the central power. Media is a means of those in power [...] I will give an example. In The Netherlands, uhm if one person would be killed by a Muslim, Muslims are also people, there all just people, uhm then the entire country will rebel. If literally dozens of Mosque's are burned down, that will not be reported in the media and Muslim women who are beaten with chains, an iron chain in the east of Amsterdam, yeah that will not be reported [...] And if it happens the other way around, than it has no influence whatsoever. So really it a means to influence our thinking. (7)

Media is dus vooral psychologisch middel van de machthebbers [...] maar media is niet ehm centrale macht. Media is een middel van de machthebber [...] ik zal een voorbeeld geven. In Nederland, ehm als 1 persoon zou gedood zijn door een Moslim, Moslims is ook mensen, zijn allemaal mensen, ehm komt hele land tot opstand. Als echt tientallen Moskee 's zijn verbrand komt niet in de media enne Moslima' zijn met een ketting geslagen, een ijzeren ketting geslagen in Amsterdam Oost. Of ja ja zal niet in de media komen. Als het andersom gebeurt, dan heeft het helemaal geen invloed. Dus eigenlijk is dat een bepalend middel die onze denkproces beïnvloed. (7)

I personally think, if it goes on like this, you know you have countries with a much better economy at the moment, than in The Netherlands and if, if the society keeps turning against the development of the allochthonous population, they will broaden their horizons and go elsewhere. (11)

Ik denk persoonlijk echt wel dat als het zo door gaat, je hebt landen met een veel beter economie op dit moment als als in Nederland en als en als de maatschappij zich zo blijft keren tegen de ontwikkeling van allochtonen dan zullen ze vast wel hun horizon verbreden en ergens anders naartoe gaan. (11)

Appendix D

CD-ROM containing all transcripts used in this study