MAINSTREAMING IN PRACTICE

THE EFFICIENCIES AND DEFICIENCIES OF MAINSTREAMING IN THE NETHERLANDS

Ilona van Breugel, Xandra Maan and Peter Scholten

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Erasmus University Rotterdam

UP STREAM
MAINSTREAMING
INTEGRATION
GOVERNANCE

UPSTREAM: Workpackage 4

June 2015

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

This report focuses on how mainstreaming of integration governance is put in practice in the Netherlands. How does mainstreaming work in practice, and what are the main (perceived) effects of mainstreaming? This analysis builds on earlier reports on how mainstreaming should be defined in the field of integration governance (Van Breugel, Maan and Scholten 2014) and on why integration policies are being 'mainstreamed' in the Netherlands (Maan, Van Breugel and Scholten 2014).

The UPSTREAM project analyses how, why and to what effect governments at the EU, national and local level mainstream their migrant integration policies. In the previous phase of the research we explored the "paper reality" of mainstreaming in the case studies, while this report explores the empirical reality. It focuses on mainstreaming in practice at the street level. It also explores what effects of mainstreaming can be identified in terms of policy coordination, policy practices and policy outcomes. We also pay particular attention to how mainstreaming affects vulnerable groups.

The research involves an analysis of structures of policy coordination and of experiences with the implementation of mainstreaming into concrete policy measures, as well as an analysis of the perceived outcomes of mainstreaming. We have developed rich portrait of case studies, using multiple stakeholder analysis. It was not the aim to evaluate the local authorities' delivery in these subfields, or to scientifically assess the efficacy of specific policy or practice. Instead, we gathered and triangulated the views of different stakeholders who have experienced how these practices unfold on the ground, and reflected on these independently from the perspective of our own comparative knowledge.

1.1 Partial mainstreaming in the Netherlands

The Netherlands is one of the European countries where 'mainstreaming' of integration governance continues to play a significant role, albeit not explicitly so. Nevertheless the shift from group specific policies to generic policies has been a political priority since at least the 2000s. The Netherlands was also one of the first European countries to experience an assimilationist turn, which strongly relates to the mainstreaming trend in Dutch integration policies.

Our analysis of the 'politics of mainstreaming' in the Netherlands (Maan, Van Breugel and Scholten, 2014) showed that mainstreaming in itself is not a new phenomenon in Dutch integration policies. In spite of Dutch policies being internationally renowned for their group-specific 'multiculturalist' approach, the issue of mainstreaming has been part of Dutch immigrant integration debates from the very beginning. Already in the 1980s, the defining policy slogan was to have specific policies wherever necessary and generic policies wherever possible, even though Dutch government then pursued many target group specific policies.

New about recent developments in terms of 'mainstreaming' in Dutch integration governance is the extent to which specific measures have made place for generic policies and the extent to which policy responsibilities have been differentiated or even 'diluted.' The analysis of both education policies and social cohesion policies, show a shift from specific measures to generic policy measures, resulting in a

full abandoning of specific measures by the end of the 2000s. This applies to the national level as well as to Rotterdam and Amsterdam, albeit in somewhat different paces.

However, our research also showed that generic measures were often framed as needs- and area-based 'proxy policies'. Instead of explicitly targeting migrant groups education policies focus, for instance, on educational level of parents and the location of the school as needs-based and area-based proxies for ethnicity. In social cohesion policies, a similar strategy can be discerned, but then based on income-level and liveability issues per neighbourhood, very similar to the French Urban Priority Zones. For instance, the 'power-boroughs approach' or the special approach for the South of Rotterdam were explicitly legitimated within policy discourses with reference to ethnic relations.

However, we have also observed that mainstreaming, as defined in this project, was only partial in the Dutch case. In the UPSTREAM project, mainstreaming is defined as a shift toward generic policies, oriented at a pluralist society and involving poly-centric forms of governance. We found that a pluralist orientation was much less evident in the Netherlands, especially not at the national level (but more so in the city of Amsterdam and Rotterdam). In fact, developments such as the 'participation declaration' that has been launched at the national level and supported by Rotterdam in particular, suggests a continued focus on cultural monism rather than a recognition of pluralism. Furthermore, the Dutch case also revealed problems in terms of establishing effective poly-centric forms of governance. Not only were there evident contradictions between national and local policies, there was also a clear lack of interdepartmental coordination and a risk of 'diluting' a coherent vision on integration. Furthermore, we did find that the provision of 'ethnic statistics' on the social and economic position of migrant groups continues to play a key role in the coordination of Dutch integration policies, in spite the 'mainstreaming' of these policies.

1.2 Integration mainstreaming in practice

This report builds on earlier analyses of to what extent Dutch policies have been mainstreamed, and why mainstreaming takes and has taken place. This report now focuses more specifically on how and to what effect mainstreaming is implemented in actual policy practices. How does mainstreaming work in practice? And, what are the consequences of mainstreaming for policy coordination, policy practices and policy outcomes?

This means, first, that this report focuses on the implementation of mainstreaming (in contrast to the focus on the conceptualization and rationale of mainstreaming in previous reports). Migrant integration policies have a long history in terms of changes on the level of policy discourses, which not always affect policy practices to an equal extent. Many scholars have described integration policies in terms of 'symbolic politics' (Scholten 2011). Therefore, this report examines empirically how and to what extent the changes that have been defined in previous reports actually work out in practice. Is mainstreaming yet another discourse shift, or does it reflect a change in policy practices?

This speaks to all three dimensions of mainstreaming that are identified in the UPSTREAM project; generic policies, diversity orientation and poly-centric governance. For generic policies it is important to see how this works out in practice. For instance, if integration policies are mainstreamed into generic fields, to what extent does integration remain a concern or priority within these generic fields?

For the diversity orientation, it is very important to find out to what extent a 'whole society' orientation at diversity is actually part of policy practices. Finally, for poly-centric governance, it is very important to analyse empirically how, in the context of mainstreaming, relations between different fields coordinated to maintain a coherent policy vision.

Besides the focus on how mainstreaming works in practice, we also make an analysis of the perceived effects of mainstreaming. By analysing the perceptions of stakeholders of how mainstreamed policies manage to achieve integration outcomes and of how effective coordination mechanisms are. We will pay particular attention to how mainstreaming affects vulnerable groups. Is it so that mainstreaming works for more established migrant groups, whereas it may lead to diminished attention relatively vulnerable groups? And do governments have methods for identifying 'vulnerable' groups that may slip through? Are there any promising practices that enable public authorities to meet specific needs within a mainstream context?

1.3 Methodology

Within the broader context of the UPSTREAM project, the analysis of the practice of mainstreaming focuses on two Dutch cities (Amsterdam and Rotterdam) and two areas (education and social cohesion). However as an analysis of the practice of mainstreaming should be able to reach out to the 'street-bureaucracy level', where policies are being interpreted while putting them into practice and where the effects of policies may become manifest first, a further demarcation will be introduced that is comparative to methodological decisions taken in other UPSTREAM countries.

Topic selection

First of all, the focus of the project within the two areas of education and social cohesion has been narrowed down further. This allows for a more in-depth analysis of stakeholder perceptions of the effects of mainstreaming in these areas. For both areas one 'subtopic' was selected that is more generic of nature and one that is more specific of nature. This method of selection allows us to compare the consequences of mainstreaming between a subtopic that is already more generic and one that involves more specific issues in relation to migration and diversity. Theoretically, based on preceding UPSTREAM reports, one may expect mainstreaming to be most effective in fields where the needs of all recipients of services are generic as well. In contrast, in cases where the needs of migrants of most specific, the need for monitoring to whether generic measures actually manage to target these specific needs is most manifest. The following subtopics have been selected:

- Education
  - Early childhood education and care (generic)
  - Language testing and support (specific)
- Social Cohesion
  - Anti-poverty or anti-exclusion neighbourhood programs (generic)
  - Anti-racist strategies and equality monitoring (specific)
  - monitoring (specific)

Site selection

In addition, the focus on research sites has been narrowed down further for each of the different country cases. This involves a focus on one neighbourhood known for concentrations of migration-related concerns, and one neighbourhood that is diverse but also more upcoming in socio-economic terms, as an illustration of the working of mainstreaming in different contexts. Within the Dutch cities we have selected two districts each; *Delfshaven* and *IJselmonde* in Rotterdam and the districts *Zuidoost* and *Oost* in Amsterdam. The districts and their demographic conditions are briefly described below. Taken the different demographic settings of the neighbourhoods it is important to see how (non-)mainstreamed policies work out in these varying contexts. However for the Dutch context is should also be remarked that due to the changing structure of the government, the boroughs as an official level of authority have been abolished as of March 2014. While previously run by their own – elected- district-council, the boroughs have now ascended in the central city level, whereby the latter is now the most important level of governance for most social cohesion and education matters.

As described in more detail in the chapters below, education policies are designed primarily from the city level, and additionally managed by the respective school boards. Social cohesion policies are strongly decentralized to the local level. While in housing, over the years more emphasis has come to the implementation at the neighbourhood level, under the current abolishment of the borough-status this too is now primarily directed from the city level. While anti-discrimination too are increasingly framed in local terms, little to no difference is made here at the district level. Altogether it must be said, that while zooming in on the respective districts (or former boroughs) often the central-city level forms the most relevant level of analysis. Also, considering larger area-based programs such as the National Program Rotterdam South. It must thus be remarked that in the Dutch context the differences between the boroughs are difficult to distinguish.

Rotterdam: Delfshaven and IJselmonde

The district of Delfshaven (74.537 inhabitants)[1] is considered one of the 'classic' immigration areas. In Delfshaven 65,3% of the households are of a migrant background, primarily of a Surinamese and Turkish background. The third biggest group non-native Dutch citizens in the area is from the European Union[2]. Recently, the area specifically receives an influx of Eu-mobile workers. Together with Feyenoord and Charlois, Delfshaven hosts the highest number of EU-mobile citizens (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2013: p.11). The district area of Delfshaven scores negative in the field of the social index, the safety index and particularly on the physical index. The area scores particularly low on liveability (Gemeente Rotterdam 2014). Overall the area is considered 'problematic', the low average income and limited language proficiency make the area particularly vulnerable (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2012: p. 14-15). For a few of its most vulnerable neighbourhoods an integral (area-based) door-to-door approaches has been developed, targeting inter alia issues around desolation, income, debts (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2014b: p.39). Delfshaven receives a relative high percentage of recently

---

[1] In 2014, see http://rotterdamincijfers.nl/home?ReturnUrl=%2f
[2] Comparison of the ethnicity of the head of the household,12,3% Surinamese, 10,2% Turks and 8,8% European Union (of total householdsin Delfshaven), see
http://rotterdamincijfers.nl/jive/report/?id=bevolking&openinputs=true (select 'gebied' 'Delfshaven')

settled foreigners[3] (Gemeente Rotterdam 2014). As one of the areas with the highest concentration of EU mobile citizens it is additionally subject to a number of area- and person-based measures from the 'Implementation Agenda Labourmigration' targeting problems around the influx of labour migrants from Central- and Eastern Europe. Some schools in the area have a high concentration of children of Central- and Eastern Europe (Gemeente Rotterdam 2013, p.11). These interventions aim to reduce housing nuisance and exploitation, concentrating on the selected areas (p. 8, 18).

The population in IJselmonde (58.495 inhabitants)[4] changed rapidly over the previous decennium, with an increasing number of citizens with a migrant background (Deelgemeente IJselmonde, 2010: p. 7). Currently the area of IJselmonde counts 40% inhabitants of a migrant background, amongst whom primarily people of Surinamese and Antillean background. The third group non-native Dutch citizens in the area is from the European Union[5]. The area scores beneath the city average when it comes to perceived bonding and participation in the neighbourhood, and scores low on perceived liveability and safety in the area (Gemeente Rotterdam 2014). Overall the area is considered 'vulnerable'. Although the 'social score' for IJselmonde has dropped over the past years (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2012: p. 22-23), it still scores around the Rotterdam average. As part of the National Program Rotterdam South four neighbourhoods are appointed as focus-areas, part of an intensive, integral social-, fysical- and security-approach in order to lift the living conditions in the areas. Additionally '*Bureau Frontlijn*' operates in these selected areas, with an active 'beyond the front door' approach in multi-problem families. The district aims to expand this approach with inter alia a focus on young families and basic skills in child rearing (Deelgemeente IJselmonde, 2014: p. 31).

Amsterdam: Zuidoost and Oost

Amsterdam Zuidoost (84.071 inhabitants)[6] has the highest percentage of non- Western immigrants in Amsterdam and is generally considered a traditional immigration area. Certain neighbourhoods in the area such as Bijlmer are known for receiving many immigrants of Surinamese and Antillean descent since the seventies. 73,4% of the district's population has a migrant background, 64% of the total population are of non-Western origin. By far most of the migrants are of Surinamese background (31,3%), and 'other non-Western' groups (24,2%)[7], amongst whom more recently many citizens of inter alia Ghanaian background. In comparison to Rotterdam and areas of IJselmonde and particularly Delfshaven the representation of citizens of a foreign-western background is remarkably low (9,2% of total population). Additionally the area host a considerable group of irregular migrants too. Zuidoost is qualified as a 'focus area' (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2015: p. 43), scoring particularly low on liveability

---

[3] Citizens of foreign background that have settled in the Netherlands within the last two years, measures on January 1st, 2013. See: http://wijkprofiel.rotterdam.nl/nl/rotterdam/delfshaven/delfshaven,rotterdam-centrum,noord,hillegersberg-schiebroek,kralingen-crooswijk,prins-alexander,ijsselmonde,charlois,hoogvliet,hoek-van-holland,rotterdam,overschie,feijenoord,pernis,rozenburg/sociale-index/capaciteiten-objectief/ed:ec

[4] In 2014, see http://rotterdamincijfers.nl/home?ReturnUrl=%2f

[5] Comparison of the ethnicity of the head of the household, 9,7% Surinamese, 5,3% Antilleans and 5,5% European Union (of total households in IJselmonde) see http://rotterdamincijfers.nl/jive/report/?id=bevolking&openinputs=true (select 'gebied' 'IJselmonde')

[6] In 2014, see http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/media/Amsterdam%20in%20cijfers%202014/#70/z

[7] Percentage of total population. See: http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/feiten-en-cijfers/#

(p. 49) and self-sustainability (p.58) and education (p.60). Additionally the social workers we spoke to in the area mention poverty and single-parent families as dominant social problems[8].

Amsterdam Oost (126.157 inhabitants)[9] is diverse area, hosting typical family-neighbourhoods as well as neighbourhoods with a high percentage of elderly people and a diverse representation of different ethnic groups. Over the last years the area is qualified as 'upcoming' and 'gentrifying' (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2015: p. 43). 38,5% of its citizens are of a foreign background, 32,5% of the total population are of non-Western origin. The biggest group consist of the foreigners of western descent (15%), followed by Moroccans (10%) 'other non-Western groups' (9,1%) and Surinamese (7,5%)[10]. The area scores average on liveability and positive on income. Both Amsterdam Zuidoost and Oost were previously (partly) targeted as 'Power Boroughs' under a national program on focus areas (introduced in 2007). Consequently they have been subject to several area-based neighbourhood approaches. Additionally extra poverty reduction programs are run in Zuidoost. Like the intervention programs in Rotterdam, '*Kansrijk Zuidoost'*, operates by an active door-to-door approach.

Methods

The analysis of the practice of mainstreaming in these sites and in these areas is based on a combination of three types of methods. First, 34 in-depth qualitative interviews with various types of stakeholders were conducted; 19 in Amsterdam and 15 in Rotterdam. A full list of respondents can be found in appendix A. The respondents were selected with the aim of a multi-stakeholder analysis, to analyse the policy effects by collecting the perceptions of actors in very different positions (policymakers, policy practitioners and representatives of NGO's). The analysis then integrates perceptions of effects from different positions, providing a balanced account of how and why policy is assessed in specific ways by actors in different positions.

Secondly, a qualitative analysis was made of policy documents (national and local policy documents) and policy evaluations (wherever available). These documents were analysed to search for references to aspects of mainstreaming on the respective subtopics and served to reconstruct the policy development and implementation on these topics, dating back to approximately five years.

Thirdly, two focus groups were held with stakeholders from both cities (Rotterdam 25 February 2015, Amsterdam 24 February 2015). Both focus groups involved 7 stakeholders, again selected from different positions (local government, NGO) and for different areas (education, social cohesion). The focus groups were intended to verify and deepen the preliminary research findings.

---

[8] E.g. Coordinator and voluntary consultants Support Organisation - Living, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 18th of March 2015; Coordinator home-visits Support Organisation, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

[9] In 2014, see http://rotterdamincijfers.nl/home?ReturnUrl=%2f

[10] Percentage of total population. See: http://www.os.amsterdam.nl/feiten-en-cijfers/#

Chapter 2 Education

Education in the Netherlands is considered a key sector for migrant integration. As a 'mainstream' policy area, it has always played a major role in migrant integration strategies. Children are still seen as 'the future', and therefore the most important key for improvement and development. As one of the policy advisors formulated it[11]: "*Integration used to focus on adults (…) but that is not future-proof. To reverse the trend, you should aim at the children, at qualitative education and at parental involvement*". Preventing and combatting (language) disadvantages in education, both for native and migrant children, has always been an important topic for the Ministry of Education[12].

In this chapter we focus on two subfields within the educational disadvantages policy. On the one hand we will study *Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC)* and on the other hand we will focus on *language interventions*. Whereas ECEC is expected to be more open to all children, thus arranged by generic policies, language interventions are expected to be arranged in specific and targeted policy measures. The key questions to answer in this chapter are; how do central and local governments mainstream migrant integration policies in these policy-sub-fields of education? What effects can be identified? And, how do mainstreaming practices in these policy-sub-fields identify, monitor and affect vulnerable groups?

To answer the abovementioned research questions we will analyse the policies on ECEC and language interventions on the national, municipal and borough-level. This report will focus on the formulation of target-groups, to what extent the financing is connected to target groups or not, the role monitoring plays in the policy cycle and overall, to what extent migrant needs are met within the specific or generic policies. First, we will give a short introduction to the division of responsibilities between the different levels of state actors and non-state actors. Then the (effects of) ECEC policies and, consequently, language interventions policies are discussed. Finally, we will answer the main questions with regard to the policy effects of mainstreaming immigrant integration in education in the conclusion.

Due to the didactical freedom of schools education is a policy-area characterized by poly-centric governance. In several instances, obligatory consultations between ECEC facilities, primary schools and municipalities are in place. The Ministry of Education provides the frameworks of ECEC, primary education and secondary education. The ministries of Education, Health and Sport and the (former) Minister of Youth and Family were so-called system-responsible for parts of these educational arrangements (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009). The financial recourses for ECEC and educational disadvantages policies come from the budget of the Ministry of Education. Additionally, they are responsible for the monitoring of national goals, the implementation of studies regarding the effects of ECEC and language interventions, to involve large cities in the determination of training requirements and to stimulate the connection between training and practice of ECEC-employees (Minister van OCW & Wethouder Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin Rotterdam, 2012).

---

[11] Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015

[12] Officially called 'The Ministry for Education, Culture and Science' with OCW as the Dutch abbreviation.

Municipalities are responsible for making arrangements with ECEC-facilities and school boards on the connection between pre-school and early school to assure 'continuous learning pathways' for children. Additionally, in consultation they should formulate how they want to implement language interventions in their municipality and what the intended results of ECEC and language interventions are. Since the abolishment of boroughs as an official level of government in Rotterdam and Amsterdam several responsibilities have been once again centralized to the city-level. The boroughs therefore have no official obligations regarding the educational system.

Formally, "*the responsibility for overall education lies with the schools, including the prevention and combatting of educational disadvantages*" (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009). Funding and main guidelines are given by the national and local governments, but in the end schools and ECEC facilities are in charge of the implementation of the policies.

2.1   Early childhood education and care

Early childhood education and care (ECEC) is a preventive measure addressing language problems at an early age. It is composed of two elements: pre-school and 'early school'. Pre-school involves day-care or playgroups[13] which are connected to primary schools through a coherent pedagogical program. These facilities are often located in the same building as the connected primary school. Preschool aims to improve the language comprehension of toddlers between 2.5 and 4 years. Subsequently, early school is a program that devotes extra attention to language-development in the first two classes of primary school *(in Dutch: kleuterklassen)*. ECEC policies started in 2000 and have developed in three stages since then: at first the emphasis was placed on the existence and dissemination of acknowledged ECEC programs, thereafter the emphasis relocated to reaching the children that should use ECEC facilities and finally, since 2010, a new approach was added to increase the quality of ECEC (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009).

In the UPSTREAM project, mainstreaming is defined as a shift toward generic policies, oriented at a pluralist society and involving poly-centric forms of governance. In ECEC the change of the funding system of primary education in 2006[14] led to changes in the organization of ECEC as well. Since then, municipalities are responsible for preschools while primary schools are responsible for early school. This 'cut' between the responsibilities led to an increase of polycentric governance since municipalities need to consult childcare facilities and schools together to provide continual learning pathways. Another result is that municipalities received discretionary power to define their own target populations, as long as it concerns children that risk having language disadvantages (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009). ECEC is thus not per se portrayed as an intervention for immigrant children. The national official definition is framed very generically, but leaves it up to municipalities whether the policy implementation is generic or specific. The final dimension of mainstreaming, inclusiveness or orientation at a pluralist society, is not recognizable in the national guidelines and laws on ECEC itself. However, the associated policies regarding parental involvement in ECEC are linked to language

---

[13] Playground facilities are historically organised and subsidised by municipalities and only provide childcare for a couple of shifts a week. Day-care facilities are distinct insofar that they are often privately operated, provide full-day and full-workweek accommodation and therefore they often attract another type of participants than playgrounds. Although the financial system is changing constantly, working parents used to be compensated for childcare costs only if the child attended day-care rather than a playground. Since the implementation of the Law Oke, the two systems are increasingly harmonized in terms of financial possibilities for parents and quality requirements.

[14] See Maan, Van Breugel and Scholten (2014).

classes of parents, *inburgering* (integration) (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2010), and increasing knowledge on the Dutch school system (Minister voor Immigratie, Integratie en Asiel, 2012).

2.1.1 Target groups and funding

Children that are eligible for ECEC are called 'target toddlers'. The amount of funding that municipalities receive from the national government is based on the target group as extrapolated from the target group in early schools, using the definitions of the weighing system. These definitions are based on parental educational levels[15].

Although Rotterdam held on to a specific definition of 'target toddlers' including an ethnic component for several years (Maan, Van Breugel & Scholten, 2014), this definition has recently been adapted (subject to approval by the City Council). The new definition of the target group is based on the spoken language at home (Dutch or not), the educational level of the parents and a 'lexi' language test (Wethouder van Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin, 2014). Whether a child is considered a 'target toddler' can only be indicated by the CJG, the family health clinic. Due to this change, the ECEC-policy of Rotterdam is now framed generically rather than specific. Therefore, it is formally mainstreamed. The municipality provides subsidies for day-care facilities, based on the amount of target toddlers that follow an ECEC-program for at least ten hours a week. Other ECEC facilities receive lump-sum financing based on group sizes (13/14 or 15/16). Priority is given to continuation of existing ECEC facilities, the transformation of ECEC facilities in 'group 0' facilities[16] (especially in the NPRS area) and the extension of ECEC facilities in boroughs with the most target toddlers. Parents have to pay a maximum of 21 cents per toddler per hour for the assigned 10 or 12,5 hours a week.

Amsterdam used to apply an elaborate flow chart that included parental background (language spoken at home, educational level), the absence of a stimulating environment (focusing on interaction) and pedagogical inabilities (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2010). However, Amsterdam also recently adjusted their official definition and restricted it to the parental level of education and the 'language richness' *(in Dutch: taalarm vs. taalrijk)* at home (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2014). Although the original definition was already 'mainstreamed', the new definition is even broader. Amsterdam hereby distinguishes itself from the ECEC-facilities as offered in Rotterdam. Contrary to Rotterdam, the city of Amsterdam provides all children with free attendance in ECEC facilities[17], although target toddlers are allowed to attend four half-days and non-target toddlers are only allowed to attend 2 half-days for free.

2.1.2 Effects

Many ECEC-employees agree that the target group definitions as used by the municipalities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam are not ideal[18]. Several reasons can be distinguished in both cities. Firstly,

---

15 The municipalities also have an obligation to organise sufficient places for the number of target toddlers. No matter if or how the municipal definition deviates from the weighing system. Overall, the municipality will only be assessed on the number of places, rather than who occupies these spots and for what reason (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009).

[16] These facilities deviate from other ECEC facilities to the extent that they are placed under the auspices of primary schools. The children are part of the school with regard to the educational content and care structures. Group 0 provides children with 12,5 hours of program versus 10 hours in other ECEC facilities.

[17] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015.

[18] Coordinator toddler consultants, interviewed 16th of December 2014; ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; CEO/ECEC facility and Team manager of the four ECEC locations, interviewed 13th of January 2015.

the lexi language-test has actually never been fully implemented in Rotterdam[19]. The only child-focused characteristic of the target definition is thereby excluded and the remaining definition is equal to the definition used in Amsterdam. Secondly, teachers indicate that parental characteristics such as their language at home or educational level may be good, but not sufficient, indicators. Several teachers and policy advisors acknowledge that it is primarily important that parents talk to their children in a language they command well rather than speaking flawed Dutch[20]. Additionally, there is no full coherence between the linguistic capacities of parents and children[21]. Therefore are some children excluded based on the linguistic capacities of their parents, which does not match the linguistic capacities – and thus needs- of the child[22]. A third and final argument will be elaborated more extensively below.

ECEC is implemented with the goal of a fair chance to develop as a child (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009) and to start primary school without (language) disadvantages. Throughout time, one can notice a pendulum in this main goal, from a more broadly formulated focus on 'development' to a specific focus on 'decrease of language disadvantages'. As written in a letter to the House of Commons in 2013 (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2013): "*Municipalities have the policy discretion to determine the target group. However, it is supposed to be about children for whom ECEC is meant. That involves children with a risk on a Dutch language disadvantage because of a deficient supply of the language in their environment. In practice, municipalities broaden the target group definition to enable children with other problems to attend ECEC facilities. The question is whether ECEC is the right intervention for these children*". Language disadvantages should be the leading indicator to provide children with ECEC, according to the national government. However, ECEC professionals directly oppose this stance. According to them, much more attention should be paid to socio-emotional development. In itself this development is an important, however, its importance can also be recognized in relation to language development. Children that are more socially capable learn by social contact[23]. Additionally, socio-emotional development in ECEC facilities increases when children start to attend the program immediately when allowed (2,5 years[24]). Finally, mixing children that might have different reasons for attending ECEC helps the development of all children as the less developed children can profit of the attendance of more developed children. Amsterdam provides free ECEC for all children. This is a considerate choice from an anti-segregation perspective (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2014), but results in new divisions as some children only attend half a program. Which is ineffective according to the teachers: "*We are working with a program, those children miss out on half of everything*"[25].

Veen et al. (2012) conclude that most children are effectively reached with ECEC facilities. Playgrounds are especially important as three-quarter of the children attend them versus a quarter of the children

---

[19] Coordinator toddler consultants, interviewed 16th of December 2014.

[20] Coordinator toddler consultants, interviewed 16th of December 2014; ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015; Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015.

[21] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015; CEO of a primary school, interviewed 6th of March 2015.

[22] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015.

[23] Coordinator toddler consultants, interviewed 16th of December 2014; ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015.

[24] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015.

[25] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015.

that are visiting day-care. "*Migrant groups such as Turks and Moroccans, who were barely reached with regular playgrounds, are now attracted to the ECEC facilities in large numbers*" (p.7). ECEC-attendance by children of Antillean or Surinamese backgrounds was lagging behind. Their parents make more use of day-care facilities than other migrant groups and the use of ECEC in day-care was developing slower than in playgrounds. Over recent years and with recent regulations (such as the Law Oke), day-care facilities are more and more transforming into ECEC-facilities as well. Several of the interviewed municipal staff members in the study (Veen et al., 2012) could not indicate which groups are not reached sufficiently. However, new migrant groups seem the least informed about ECEC facilities.

The parental involvement policies of Amsterdam are formulated in generic terms. Although it is not emphasized, 'customization' is applied when it becomes apparent that a certain group is not reached with the generic policies[26]. An opinion monitor 'Active parents' was conducted in 2013 and resulted in the recognition of four different groups of parents; divided on high/low education and with/without knowledge of the Dutch educational system (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2013). Consequently, the municipality started customizations in order to enable these parents access to generic information. One example of this approach was the translation of the taaltips.nl webpage (language tips) in several other languages and the introduction of Coffee mornings where parents can discuss questions and tips regarding language and parental involvement issues. Although these mornings are open to all parents, it was mainly migrant parents that attend them[27]. Additionally, both Rotterdam and Amsterdam have programs for parents to learn the Dutch language, in combination with parental involvement. Many of the teachers indicate that they regularly refer parents to these facilities[28].

To summarize, ECEC and parental involvement policies have been (re)formulated in generic terms over the years, although some differences between Rotterdam and Amsterdam remain. Target groups are formulated in broader terms in Amsterdam than in Rotterdam. Although new migrants seem least informed, no specific groups seem to fall out. The reach of these policies is in fact considered sufficient, although the reach of e.g. specific migrant groups is not considered a priority in this. In the parental involvement policies that while primarily generically formulated these policies are specified were necessary when certain groups are not sufficiently reached.

2.1.3 Monitoring

ECEC facilities have to provide basic information about their utilization-level, amount of target-toddlers and amount of other toddlers, the length of the waiting list (target-toddler/no target-toddler) and information on their parental analysis[29]. The parental analysis is part of the parental involvement policy and is not only focused on cultural/ethnic characteristics, but also information on employment

---

[26] Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015; Policy advisor language interventions and parental involvement in primary education of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 17th of March 2015.

[27] Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015; Policy advisor language interventions and parental involvement in primary education of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 17th of March 2015.

[28] IBC Coordinator secondary education, interviewed 9th of December 2014; Coordinator toddler consultants, interviewed 16th of December 2014; ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015; Advisor school and monitoring of the NPRS program, interviewed 3rd of March 2015; CEO of a primary school, interviewed 6th of March 2015; CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

[29] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; CEO/ECEC facility and Team manager of the four ECEC locations, interviewed 13th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015.

status and other practical wishes regarding school times etc. Consequently, most official monitoring documents on ECEC are framed in terms of development of the amount of toddlers attending preschool and the amount of possible toddlers that could attend preschool in the municipality[30]. Information on ECEC and parental involvement is collected in generic terms in most cases[31] . Rarely information is specified on (for example) heritage and educational level of parents in Amsterdam[32]. Migration-specific data are not collected at all or considered irrelevant since other indicators are considered to be better predictors[33]. Generally, one can conclude that there is very little policy-information available on national and municipal level, regarding different ethnic groups or other migration related indicators as these are not explicit priorities. In scientific studies, more information is available, such as in the PRE-COOL cohort study which is used in studies on ECEC effectiveness and attendance, in which children with a migrant background are explicitly measured too (Veen et al., 2012). However, it is only through these scientific studies that some information may flow back to the Ministry of Education.

2.2   Learning the language

Several language interventions are implemented in order to decrease language disadvantages of both migrant and native children. Examples of these interventions are (international) bridge classes, (language) summer schools and so-called 'head classes'. In 2010, the '*Oké'*-Act provided municipalities with more opportunities to implement language interventions on top of the already existing and recognized bridge classes. In cooperation with schools, activities may be organised in order to stimulate the mastery of the Dutch Language (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009). The governance arrangements G4/G33 (selection of respectively the 4 and 33 biggest cities in the Netherlands), which followed in 2011, aim to achieve that "*children will enter primary school without language disadvantages in 2015. Additionally, the effectiveness of primary school will increase due to the use of bridge classes and summer schools*" (Minister van OCW & Wethouder Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin Rotterdam, 2012). This document repeatedly refers to bridge classes, summer schools and 'interventions with a similar goal'. The target populations of these measures are not specified concretely. The ministry of education speaks of "*students-at-risk*" who experience "*a serious disadvantage in the Dutch language*" and refrains from discussing the explicit risk-factors (Minister van OCW, 2010). Instead, municipalities are instructed to define the target populations of both ECEC and language interventions in consultation with stakeholders such as schools, playgrounds and childcare facilities (Staatssecretaris van OCW, 2009). Two dimensions of mainstreaming immigrant integration are recognizable in this approach. On the one hand, the national government formulates generic target groups in its education disadvantages policies and on the other hand, it implements a poly-centric mode of governance by both decentralizing and deconcentration the approach to language disadvantages. This leaves room for a more problem-based interference at the local level. The final dimension, inclusiveness of policies, is not identifiable in the policies regarding language interventions. In the overall educational system, this dimension is (mostly and only) covered by the

---

30 Which is the main input for defining the municipal budget for ECEC.

31 Focus Group Amsterdam, 25th of February 2015

32 Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015

33 Focus Group Amsterdam, 25th of February 2015

obligation for schools to stimulate citizenship and social inclusion (Maan, Van Breugel & Scholten, 2014).

2.2.1   Target groups

International bridge classes

'Bridge class' is a term used for two different kinds of language interventions in primary schools. On the one hand, it may refer to the one-year class aiming at newcomer children that have been in the Netherlands for less than a year and who quickly have to master the Dutch language before enrolling in regular education. On the other hand, bridge classes refer to the amalgam of ways in which students are enrolled in a class that provides them with additional language lessons throughout the year. In secondary education, the first version of the bridge class is called an 'international bridge class' (IBC)[34]. The IBC forms the educational reception policy for children between 6 and 16 years old. During this year, students are placed in separate classes on one of the schools providing IBC, which is called a central reception system. The target group of IBC is formulated by the national government as "*students who hold an official residence permit, or whose parent(s) hold an official residence permit and who are demonstrable less than a year in the Netherlands*".[35] Additionally, children originating from countries within the EU or European Community are also considered 'foreign' and thus eligible for IBC classes[36].

Regular bridge classes, summer schools & head classes

Municipalities have to consult ECEC-facilities and school-boards to jointly establish the goals and specifications of the overall goals as formulated in the G4/G33 governance arrangements. These arrangements do not contain any specification of the target groups further than the nationally used description of 'student at risk'. Policy advisors in Amsterdam indicate that they rely on the professional didactic skills of teachers and schools to select the most appropriate children for each intervention[37]. Therefore, determining the definition of the target groups of language interventions is decentralised and deconcentrated, indicating a very poly-centric mode of governance. The general education regulations of Amsterdam and Rotterdam (Wethouder van Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin, 2014; Gemeente Amsterdam, 2015) provide minor specifications of the target groups, only identifying which language intervention is suitable for children from which grades. In addition, Rotterdam provides more specifications of the target group than Amsterdam. In a separate document on the different forms of bridge classes in primary school (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2007), the municipality formulates norms regarding test scores and the absence of general learning disabilities, psychological, neurological or behavioral problems. These policies are thus targeted along problem-based criteria.

---

[34] In order to make a clear distinction in the remainder of this chapter, we will refer to IBC when speaking about newcomer classes both in primary and secondary education.

[35] (http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0035018/geldigheidsdatum_24-08-2014#Hoofdstuk5, Staatscourant 2014 nr.9217)

[36] As long as they are demonstrable less than a year in the Netherlands.

[37] Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015; Policy advisor language interventions and parental involvement in primary education of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 17th of March 2015.

2.2.2   Funding

Schools receive a standard funding based on the number of students enrolled on the 1st of October of the previous school year[38]. Additional funding is inter alia available through the so-called education disadvantages budget and governance arrangements in the G4/G33. While previously the country of origin was weighed as one of the indicators in disadvantages-policies as of 2006 this criterion has been abolished, now targeting by the level of education of the parents only (see also Maan, Breugel and Scholten, 2014: p. 26). The alternation of the so-called 'weighing system' responded to the growing attention for language deficiencies amongst the native population by mainstreaming these disadvantage-policies. Although intended to connect better to the actual language deficiencies and to reach a wider group several studies criticize its effectiveness (see e.g. Roeleveld et.al, 2011; Driessen, 2012). Additionally the Educational Council argues that ethnicity is a relevant criterion in identifying language deficiencies and advises to target accordingly (Onderwijsraad, 2013). While ethnicity has thus been abolished in generic disadvantage-policies, the (international) bridge classes, summer schools and head classes are available as additional programs and are funded separately.

International bridge classes

The funding of international bridge classes is distinct of the funding of the other language interventions. International bridge classes form the most important element of reception policies for school children. Therefore, newcomer children that fulfil the national target group definition are eligible for additional funding of the ministry of education[39]. In Amsterdam, 44% of newcomer children in 2011-2012 were not eligible for additional funding by the national government due to a lack of formal residence permit, possession of a Dutch passport or because they entered the Netherlands too long ago (Wijnbergen, 2012). Rotterdam experiences similar deviations between formal and actual attendance of IBC's. In response, both municipalities step in to provide funding for these students and additional funding for newcomer classes as a whole. This way, municipalities provide specific approaches for vulnerable groups that would have been excluded and directly mainstreamed by the national approach.

Regular bridge classes, summer schools & head classes

Municipalities receive funding for language interventions trough a targeted budget for combatting educational disadvantages. The G4/G33 governance arrangements are accompanied by an additional budget in order to achieve the arranged goals regarding both ECEC and language interventions. The municipalities are officially in control of these funds but are obliged to spend these in consultation with ECEC facilities and school boards. Schoolboards can apply for various subsidies by providing information such as on the extent of language disadvantages linked to explicit goals, on the clear and well-founded criteria to select pupils, test scores of the selected pupils and on the incorporation of parental involvement in the intervention (Wethouder van Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin, 2014; Gemeente Amsterdam, 2015). The funding schemes of Amsterdam and Rotterdam are reasonably similar. Both approaches are mainstreamed in two dimensions: generic formulation of the target groups and a

---

38 The weighing system is based on the educational level of the child's parent. Low and very low levels of education entitle the school which is attended by the child to a certain amount of additional funding. Interestingly, several sources mention that especially "proud" African parents cannot always be convinced of the necessity of being honest about their educational level for their children's' benefit (Wijnbergen, 2012; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015).

39 Primary and especially secondary schools may experience some problems with the additional funding, due to the fluctuating attendance of children and the specific so-called 'counting dates'. However, these problems are systemic in nature and are little or not related to mainstreaming. Therefore, these problems will not be discussed extensively in this report. More information on IBC in the Netherlands and these funding-related problems can be retrieved from www.lowan.nl .

strong poly-centric approach towards the further specification of the target group and actual content of the language interventions.

2.2.3 Effects

International bridge classes

Teachers in both primary and secondary education endorse the necessity of IBC for newcomer children. The classes are seen as essential since "*regular schools are insufficient for the newcomer to master the language*"[40]. However, issues are identified with regard to the length of the program and the restrictions of the target group. Officially, children are only eligible to attend an IBC for one school year. However, many IBC-teachers affirm that one year is too short to lift newcomer children to the level necessary for attending regular classes[41]. Hence, according to these teachers, the official IBC reception-policy is mainstreaming the children too quickly. On the contrary, Wijnbergen (2012) found that teachers in Amsterdam describe the IBC year in primary schools as a sufficient start, although "*newcomer education doesn't stop after a year. Most newcomer-pupils will be qualified as pupils with special needs who are entitled to appropriate education*" (p.31). These obligations regarding support for ex-IBC children are for example formulated in the 2014 law 'appropriate education'. Although the newcomer status itself is no explicit criterion, the law imposes the schools with a duty of care and to organise attendance for all pupils with special needs, for example, children with disabilities, dyslexia, behavioural problems and a higher or lower than average intelligence. The care of ex-IBC pupils in primary school is mainstreamed within this generic framework (Wijnbergen, 2012).

Particularly primary schools strongly hold on to the one-year IBC for newcomer children. After this year they are included in the regular, mainstreamed, classes. In secondary education this is believed to be not sufficient, schools implement other sorts of bridge classes for up to two years as a follow-up of the official IBC[42]. These activities are often financed by other, originally generic, arrangements aiming at 'expanding the learning time' of all students. Thus, generic financial arrangements aimed at combatting learning disadvantages are used to further support specific newcomer children. In comparison, secondary schools are more reluctant than primary schools to mainstream newcomer children after the first year and therefore they are more prone to continue a specific targeted approach for one or two additional years.

A study of IBC attendees in primary education in Amsterdam concludes that the pupils have not been able to fully catch up with their peers within one and a half year following the IBC (Boer, 2011). The studies indicate that 'regular' teachers do not always know how to support the former-IBC pupils. Another study (Wijnbergen, 2012) emphasizes the necessity of better coordination of after-care and that not all students are given a possibility to attend additional classes in order to improve their command of the Dutch language. These studies indicate that the moment the children are mainstreamed, they risk being locked in their backlogs.

The target group of international bridge classes is clearly defined by national guidelines. However, at the local level both teachers and policy advisors recognize groups of children that according to them cannot benefit from these arrangements sufficiently or cannot benefit from these arrangements at all. Toddlers are one group of children that cannot benefit from the IBC, since they have not yet

---

[40] IBC Coordinator secondary education, interviewed 9th of December 2014.

[41] Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; 0; Focus Group Rotterdam, 24th of February 2015: Coordinator IBC-classes.

[42] Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015; Focus Group Rotterdam, 24th of February 2015: Coordinator IBC-classes.

reached the age to attend an IBC in primary school. The time the toddler spends in ECEC (either playgrounds or elementary school) should be sufficient to raise the language level to the necessary level to attend regular primary school. However, teachers of both ECEC-facilities and primary schools[43] indicate that the language disadvantages of these toddlers have not decreased enough to keep up with their classmates. Again, these children are mainstreamed too quickly, before attaining a certain necessary base level. Finally, in the previous paragraph we concluded that new migrants are the least informed on ECEC. Therefore, the connection between these two approaches might be detrimental. IBC-policies assumes that toddlers attend ECEC, whereas the children of new migrants may actually be the ones that are the least likely to attend ECEC-facilities. For these children, there is no reception policy to help them get acquainted with the Dutch language and their disadvantages will increase.

Another group of children that cannot completely benefit from IBC are on the other end of the age restrictions: the 16-year-olds[44]. Although these children can enter IBC classes in secondary education, they often have to leave the IBC to enter vocational education. Additionally, some of the (older) children are illiterate. Both age and illiteracy poses secondary schools with problems regarding the developmental perspectives of these students[45][46]. Agreements between secondary schools and schools for vocational education are necessary in order to provide a fluent transition of students. However, this is not directed on by the national or local government and is thus left to the initiative of schools themselves. With regard to these students, incomplete mainstreaming due to the absence of polycentric governance results in a specific vulnerable group.

Finally, one group of children that cannot benefit from IBC according to the national guidelines are 'Dutch' students from the Dutch Caribbean areas such as Curaçao, Bonaire, Sint Maarten, Saba, Sint Eustatius and Aruba[47]. These children possess a Dutch passport, however, Papiamentu is often used as the language of instruction and the language spoken at home rather than Dutch. Therefore, these children still have reasonable language disadvantages relative to 'native' Dutch children. Both Rotterdam and Amsterdam therefore determined that these pupils are equivalent to undocumented pupils, resulting in the same eligibility for additional municipal funding[48]. Following these guidelines, municipalities are broadening the narrow target group of the national guidelines to include a vulnerable group that would otherwise be mainstreamed the moment they enter the country; a local response to perceived vulnerabilities.

Regular bridge classes, summer schools & head classes

Despite inclusiveness not being a recognizable dimension of mainstreaming in the written policies of language interventions, several elements of diversity and integration are recognizable in the implementation of the policies. Segregation is considered as a demographic fact. The often one-sided ethnic composition of the school population is considered a simple consequence of the

---

[43] IBC Teacher primary education, interviewed 8th of December 2014; ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher, ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015.

[44] CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

[45] CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

[46] Schools are obliged to provide a developmental perspective to each student entering the schools. This perspective formulates for example what goals can be achieved and how these goals can be achieved (Wijnbergen, 2012)

[47] Focus Group Rotterdam, 24th of February 2015; Coordinator IBC Classes

[48] Focus Group Rotterdam, 24th of February 2015; Coordinator IBC Classes; Focus group Amsterdam, 25th of February 2015.

UP STREAM

neighbourhoods the schools are located in[49]. The schools tend to take this context into account automatically. A super-diversity perspective is recognizable when teachers and policy advisors ask themselves: "*With so many differences, who defines the scale of integration?*"[50]. Several teachers[51] indicate that many of the children in their schools are barely leaving their borough. Therefore, "*integration is making sure that children can participate in Amsterdam and the larger society*"[52]. Many language interventions such as (international) bridge classes, the head class and summer schools are accompanied by visits to museums, the market, parks, companies, etc. Additionally, many schools implement accompanying projects on topics such as sexuality, drugs and media in order to stimulate the development of opinions, rather than judgments. This way, pupils are stimulated to express their thoughts and feelings, for example on recent events such as the Charlie Hebdo shootings in Paris.

The target population of these language interventions are not specified according to any migration-related criterion but by learning deficiency. Overall, the language interventions are focusing on the broad 'middle'-category of pupils. Children who are too 'weak', or in contrast too smart, will often be excluded from these interventions. Pupils that are classified as weak often have disadvantages on more subjects than just the Dutch language. Other groups which are excluded in practice in both Amsterdam and Rotterdam are pupils with psychological or behavioural problems and attention deficits[53]. These exclusions are mainly motivated by effectivity: "*We learned by experience that these interventions take too long for pupils with attention deficits, such as ADHD. This results in lower yields for those students and influences the performance of the other pupils as well*"[54]. Likewise, a three-week-summer school is too short in order to establish a connection between students with behavioural problems and the teachers[55]. Due to this motivation by yields and effectiveness, none of the teachers mentioned these excluded children as vulnerable groups. Those groups are targeted in the context of 'appropriate education', while the funds for language interventions are spend on the pupils of whom they expect the greatest progress. In order to achieve this progress, participants of the head classes in Amsterdam are selected on their student trajectories, behaviour, motivation and a minimal but disadvantaged proficiency of the Dutch language, and if considered necessary their IQ that thwarts the transition towards their real potential educational level in secondary education[56]. By focusing on actual language disadvantages, mostly assessed by test scores and observations of teachers, teachers and policy advisors trust that they reach the actual target group of these measures,

---

[49] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; CEO/ECEC facility and Team manager of the four ECEC locations, interviewed 13th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015; Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015; CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

[50] Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015; CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

[51] IBC Coordinator secondary education, interviewed 9th of December 2014; Head of one of the departments within a secondary school, interviewed 19th of February 2015; CEO of a primary school, interviewed 6th of March 2015; CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015; Director Head-classes ('Kopklas', interviewed 27th of March 2015.

[52] Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015.

[53] Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015; Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015; CEO of a primary school, interviewed 6th of March 2015; Director Head-classes ('Kopklas'), interviewed 27th of March 2015.

[54] CEO of a primary school, interviewed 6th of March 2015.

[55] Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015.

[56] Director Head-classes ('Kopklas'), interviewed 27th of March 2015.

independent of the migrant-related background of the student. Due to the nature of the boroughs, large proportions of the participants in language interventions have a cultural background as first, second or even third generation migrant. Overall, these language interventions are therefore mainstreamed on paper and mainstreamed in practice as well. There is no indication that the mainstreaming of language interventions counteracts the participation of pupils with a native or a migrant background.

Dutch scientific research on the effectiveness and results of these language interventions is mainly positive. The overall level of children that participated in (international) bridge classes or head classes are on average still less favorable than the level of classmates with a similar social-ethnic background (Mulder et al., 2011, p.66). However, considering their original disadvantages, their language deprivation has declined significantly compared to when they would not have attended one of these interventions. Head classes show particular positive results, indicating that participants achieve higher CITO-scores and can attend a higher level of education in secondary school. Eventually they achieve higher educational levels than children that are comparable on social-ethnic descent and CITO-scores at the end of primary school but who did not attend a head class (Mulder et al., 2008). These improvements due to extra classes are retained in the following years (Mulder et al., 2008; Hacquebord, 2012; Driessen, 2013). Overall, some children take part in bridge classes for successive years (+/- 25%), or participate in bridge classes as well as a head class (12-37%) (Mulder et al., 2008).

A large difference between Amsterdam and Rotterdam regarding the organization of language interventions and educational support is the degree of area-based approaches. Following from the National Program on Rotterdam South (see chapter 1), Rotterdam formulates different goals and opportunities for Rotterdam South or the Children zone. In other policy documents, Rotterdam highlights specific area's as well. For example by preferring head classes in the boroughs of Delfshaven and Feijenoord, after research showed that the potential target group is the biggest in these areas (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2007) or when promising additional efforts to school boards in areas with a low social index. This way, Rotterdam provides a mainstreamed approach to support specific areas with more needs as assessed on social index criteria's. Amsterdam on the other hand does not provide a separate or additional approach to the areas with distinctive disadvantages, such as the borough southeast[57]. With the abolition of the official status as boroughs, this is a concern to some of the professionals who believe that the specific challenges of the borough might be unnoticed and not acted on[58].

2.2.3   Monitoring

Overall, the educational system is monitored by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education. Supervisory frameworks are formulated for every educational sector, such as ECEC, primary schools and secondary schools. Neither of the frameworks contains items on native/immigrant characteristics of the school population. According to several teachers[59], the inspectorate actually ignored international bridge

---

[57] Policy advisor language interventions and parental involvement in primary education of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 17th of March 2015.

[58] ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015; Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015; Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015.

[59] IBC Teacher primary education, interviewed 8th of December 2014; IBC Coordinator secondary education, interviewed 9th of December 2014.

classes until a few year ago. Only recently they started taking stock on quality and performance of IBC's and to develop a specific supervisory framework. However, this framework does not aim to assess the effectiveness of IBC for specific groups and is therefore not applicable to examine which vulnerable groups are included, excluded or benefit less than other groups.

Municipalities are mostly interested in two types of information: educational results and quantitative information on attendance, target group attendance and operated hours[60]. To assess the educational results, schools can apply method-dependent and method-independent tests. The benefit of independent tests, such as CITO-tests and DIA-taal, is the possibility to compare with other schools in the same or other regions[61]. These tests results form the basis of the selection of pupils for many language interventions. This should not be considered as a need-based proxy strategy, since many schools and municipal regulations argue that actual language disadvantages should be the defining characteristic rather than other, possibly related and possibly unrelated, characteristics such as ethnicity.

Overall there are little ethnic-specific, migration-specific, or culturally-specific data collected in Amsterdam. One of the reasons for this absence is that it would highly coincide with socioeconomic status[62], a variable which *is* accounted for. Extra information on the ethnic background of the students is thus considered irrelevant. None of the schools in Amsterdam or Rotterdam mentioned that migration-related information has to be disclosed to the municipality. However, in their annual report 'The State of Rotterdam' (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2013), Rotterdam does provide information on secondary school levels, graduation rates and early leaving for natives, first generation immigrants and second generation immigrants. Overall, this knowledge can be used as a final check for the impact of the mainstreamed educational approach on specific groups. Interviews with local policy advisors[63] indicate that the municipality has a pragmatic stance towards tackling problems that are typically overrepresented in certain groups. Specific policies are sometimes perceived to be a more effective way of dealing with problems, after which the policy should be followed by generic policies[64]. This approach towards (non-)mainstreaming averts the risks of 'blind' mainstreaming: mainstreaming without knowing whether the outcomes for specific groups are equal.

2.3   Conclusions

Our analysis shows that the mainstreaming of integration in to education governance has been implemented rather effectively in the Dutch case. Both in Early Childhood Education and Care and in Language Interventions the idea of target grouping has been effectively abandoned. For ECEC, a needs-based proxy has been put in place in both Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Children are selected by their parent's level of education and the language spoken at home. For Rotterdam, there are plans to establish a language test as well, though this has not been implemented yet.

---

[60] IBC Teacher primary education, interviewed 8th of December 2014; IBC Coordinator secondary education, interviewed 9th of December 2014; Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015; Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015; Head of one of the departments within a secondary school, interviewed 19th of February 2015.

[61] Head of one of the departments within a secondary school, interviewed 19th of February 2015; CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

[62] Focus group Amsterdam, 25th of February 2015.

[63] Focus Group Rotterdam, 24th of February 2015.

[64] Focus Group Rotterdam, 24th of February 2015.

For language interventions, a mix of needs-based proxies and more targeted measures is in place. International bridge classes form an important component of reception policies targeted at newcomers who have not been longer than 1 year in the Netherlands. The aim of these classes is to address language deprivation. These classes take up to a maximum of one year, after which these newcomer children are in principle 'mainstreamed' into generic policies as well. However, there are also 'regular' bridge classes that are aimed more in general at pupils and students where language deprivation is indicated. This can include migrant as well as non-migrant children. In the city of Rotterdam, this needs-based proxy is supplemented by an area-based proxy. Particularly Rotterdam South has more means to support training to combat language deprivation.

In terms of poly-centric governance, the analysis of education shows that much discretion is allocated to local governments but also to schools and child care facilities. This seems to be an essential mechanism in making sure that these actors/stakeholders can adequately respond to the specific local situation. This proximity to 'needs' and key' areas' is key to making sure that the needs- and area-based proxies for target groups do effectively work. Where necessary, local governments use their discretion to include vulnerable groups that are officially not targeted for the language policies.

Stakeholders interviewed for this project, as well as a number of evaluation studies, indicate that the 'mainstreaming' of education policies is generally seen as quite effective. Especially, the proxy-policies seem adequately able to reach out to migrant populations. In fact, there were some concerns raised for ECEC that it still primarily attracts migrants, whereas a more mixed population would be better for both migrant children as for non-migrant children.

Also for the international and the regular bridge classes, stakeholders indicate that these measures effectively reach migrants. However, in this regard, several vulnerable categories were mentioned, such as migrants from within the Dutch kingdom who are formally not eligible for the international bridge classes. Also, it was mentioned frequently that just one year of additional assistance is not enough for the children newcomers in international bridge classes. Particularly the transition from specific facilities such as the (international) bridge classes to generic regular school classes proves to be a vulnerable moment, where migrant risk falling out as they turn out to be less familiar and least likely to visit for example the ECEC facilities. However, we have seen in both Amsterdam and Rotterdam, that local governments flexibly respond to these concerns, often extending the classes on other grounds.

What also becomes clear from our analysis is that the availability of data on ethnicity in relation to ECEC and language interventions has decreased. This makes it more difficult to get a more objective measure of whether these measures, if targeting migrant groups effectively, also manage to achieve the expected results. This may lead to what we have described as 'blind mainstreaming', so the mainstreaming of integration into generic measures without group specific data to check whether group specific problems are sufficiently being addressed. However, it is important to note that the stakeholders interviewed for this project do not see this is a great concern. Instead the demographic conditions of the student population are considered a matter of fact. Problem- or areas-based targeting is generally believed to be sufficient for dealing with this.

Chapter 3 Social Cohesion

The second policy area this report focuses on is social cohesion. Since the early 2000's immigrant integration policies have increasingly focused on social cohesion. In the context of the multicultural backlash at the beginning of the new millennium, diversity became a contested topic. This led to active intervention on social cohesion, particularly at the neighbourhood level with an interchanging focus on integration and housing. The generic and polycentric approach taken here can be considered aspects of mainstreaming. Regarding the pluralist aspect of mainstreaming however, a diversity awareness seems to dilute as the explicit attention for interethnic contact and diversity vanishes. After analyzing the politics of mainstreaming in social cohesion policies (Maan, van Breugel & Scholten, 2014) we will now look at the outcome of these policies at the street-level.

To analyse the implementation of social cohesion policies at the street-level we will zoom in on two policy fields: *housing and neighbourhood policies* and *anti-discrimination*. While housing and neighbourhood policies are typical generic policy fields, anti-discrimination can be considered a policy field specifically focused on vulnerable groups targeting discrimination on ethnicity, sexuality and age. In how far are these policies mainstreamed? And is a mainstreamed approach perceived as effective in reaching both the vulnerable groups as the wider society? Taking from our previous study on the politics of mainstreaming we will pay specific attention to super-diversity as an urban demographic condition, the influence of the politicized context of integration and diversity and the role of monitoring. Firstly, both sub-fields and its main actors are introduced, after which the perceived effects of these policies are discussed. We conclude by linking this to mainstreaming and the effects thereof in the field of social cohesion policies.

3.1   Housing and neighbourhood policies

Since the early 2000's ethnic concentration and segregation have increasingly been experienced as a policy problem. Ethnic segregation is considered a sign of failed integration and an obstruction to interethnic contact (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007, p. 9). Despite this, ethnicity is not an official criterion or priority in housing policies. Instead policies are phrased generically, aiming at a social-economic differentiation of neighbourhoods. Should this be understood as a case of effective mainstreaming in a super-diverse society or are the generic housing policies insufficient to meet the needs of this group?

At the local level the physical part of housing policies is primarily dealt with through the Urban Development department of the municipality. Other involved actors are the housing corporations, the department of social development, in particular the teams involved with the 'Area-Based Neighbourhoodapproach' (*Gebiedsgericht werken)* and a number of specific programs focusing on social-exclusion such as "*Kansrijk Zuid Oost"* in Amsterdam[65] and "*Bureau Frontlijn"* in Rotterdam[66]. Additionally in Rotterdam a specific area-based joint program between the national and local government and several other stakeholders to improve the living conditions in Rotterdam South is run, the National Program Rotterdam South ("*Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid", NPRZ*). Beyond

---

[65] While initially started as a cooperation between e.g. the borough and housing corporation this was later extended to the Centre for Work. The program now forms a part of the (former) borough.
[66] Initiated in 2006 from a cooperation between the directorates of Social Affairs and Employment, City development and housing, Taxes, Public Affairs and the Directorate Safety.

the physical aspect of city planning, the housing and neighbourhood policies in this chapter also includes social work aimed at improving the liveability at the neighbourhood level.

Both Amsterdam and Rotterdam have implemented an area-based approach in housing and social work. Immigrant integration priorities have also been framed on this level. In Amsterdam 'citizenship-participation' became a central theme in the (partly mainstreamed) integration policies since 2006 (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2006). Framed in terms of liveability and safety, social cohesion policies are developed on a neighbourhood level, in order to stimulate the integration and participation of "*all who are left on the side-line, men and women, young and old, native and immigrant citizens, they should all be motivated to participate*" (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2007, p.18), phrasing the social cohesion goals in more generic terms on a neighbourhood-level.

Rotterdam has seen a few shifts in this regard. Since the emergence of the local political party Livable Rotterdam, liveability has been explicitly on the agenda. In the 2002-2006 period initially focused mainly on spatial policies to diversify and balance the population in certain areas by spatial dispersion policies based on income as a proxy (the 'Rotterdam-Act'). However, under the new coalition from 2006 on these social cohesion efforts focus more on 'bonding and participation' (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2006)*: "It is not only about the physical encounter, but about creating actual connections and solidarity between the citizens of Rotterdam" (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2008).* Currently Livable Rotterdam is back in power and has again explicitly linked integration and housing as both topics are accommodated under one Alderman. Additionally Rotterdam is known for the so-called 'Rotterdam Act' (Officially in Dutch: *Wet Bijzondere Maatregelen Grootstedelijke Problematiek*). An Act used to control the influx of inhabitants in designated city-areas under extra-ordinary circumstances of deprivation[67]. While the Rotterdam Act was originally initiated by Marco Pastors (Leefbaar Rotterdam) as a measure to reduce the number of disadvantaged immigrants in these neighbourhoods, there was no wider local or national support for these criteria. Instead, the policy was (instead) targeted in terms of income and employment, comparable to the other housing policies from that time. "*Despite the political framing, targeting by ethnicity has never been the official goal or result of this policy*"[68].

In spite of the trend of decentralization and withdrawing of the national state in this field, the National Program Rotterdam South was developed as a special cooperation between the national government, the city of Rotterdam, educational- and care-institutions, housing-corporations and businesses intended to improve the living conditions in Rotterdam South. Due to the strong deprivation in this area, the program forms a special effort to lift the area to average level of social development of Dutch urban areas, focusing on a selection of so called 'priority' and 'crossover' areas. In its aims and vision the program raises the ethnic concentration of the neighbourhoods they work in, although this does not play a role in targeting or the policy priorities[69]. In this context the influx of immigrants from Eastern European countries is raised too.

---

[67] When 45% of the inhabitants can be qualified as low-income and 25% are regarded non-active the law is enforced. Newcomers to the region (e.g. a residence of less than six years) will be subject to income-requirements before they can settle in the respective neighbourhood.

[68] Head of Space and Living, City development department of Rotterdam, interviewed 18th of March 2015.

[69] See http://www.rotterdam.nl/algemeennprz

3.1.1   Target grouping

Since the late 1980's housing policies have been marked by major decentralizations and deregulations of government responsibilities to the open market (mid- and high range rental and owned-property) and housing corporations (social-housing)[70]. This period also marked the end of specifically targeted housing policies for ethnic minorities (Tweede Kamer, 1983). Since the 1990's housing policies are addressed primarily in generic, non-ethnic terms only, instead targeting by 'objective' labels such as income and family size. Housing policies in the nineties intended to promote a differentiation of city- and neighbourhood demographics in a broader sense (Tweede Kamer, 2004). Thereby the focus shifted to linking the physical aspect of city planning more explicitly to the social side of housing and living and liveability (whether or not in the context of ethnicity). These policies are primarily area- and problem-based. Again, in the following decennium housing- and neighbourhood policies were simultaneously characterized by decentralization (DG WWI, 2007; *Tweede Kamer, 2006*), with the neighbourhoods and 'the street' becoming important parameters for both integration and social cohesion. Since then the explicit link between integration and housing has disappeared of the national agenda, but, depending on the Coalition, it has been a political and policy priority in Rotterdam - addressing ethnic concentration in certain deprived areas and its (alleged) influence on integration outcomes.

The basis of integral and polycentric housing policies can be found in the 'Big Cities Policy'-programs of 1994 (in Dutch: *Grotestedenbeleid*). These can be considered the first case of mainstreaming in terms of polycentric governance for the large urban areas in the Netherlands. Over the years this approach was expanded to other cities and towns, with a focus on so-called problem neighbourhoods. The most well-known approach in this regard is the Neighbourhood-approach as initiated by Minister Vogelaar (2007). A national program investing in a selection of 40 vulnerable neighbourhoods throughout the country. These integral and area-based approaches are characterized by the polycentric cooperation between the local government, housing corporations and the citizens. As part of the current three big decentralisations[71] this approach is now broadened from the problem neighbourhoods to *all* neighbourhoods, shifting the focus further to frontline workers.

After the killing of filmmaker and columnist Theo van Gogh by a radicalized second generation Dutch-Moroccan on the streets of Amsterdam in 2004, segregation came high on the agenda in the context of polarisation and radicalization, with interethnic contact as a priority in itself. But over the years the attention for this aspect of integration diminished. In terms of mainstreaming, Dutch housing policies are phrased generically. However, they thereby tend to disregard the issue of interethnic contact altogether rather than having a mainstreamed concern for integration. As the explicit attention for pluralism disappears, the question remains in how far the generic housing policies are inclusive and effectively reaching the entire population in the neighbourhood. Thirdly, housing- and neighbourhood policies are strongly decentralised (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken, 2013), with special attention for the neighbourhood level, and coordinated horizontally between departments, mainly the department of city development and that of social development. While limited in its diversity awareness, housing and neighbourhoodpolicies can be considered mainstreamed in terms of policy

---

[70] See *Nota Volkshuisvesting in de jaren negentig (1989)*.

[71] *'Project Integrale Aanpak'* see Kamerbrief over voortgang wijkaanpak, 19-11-2014, accessed through http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/leefbaarheid/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2014/11/19/kamerbrief-over-voortgang-wijkaanpak-in-2014.html

targeting and coordination. Are the current, generic, neighbourhood policies able to serve the diversity of its inhabitants?

3.1.2 Effects

While diversity is not a central policy priority in itself it can still come up as a policy concern when considered relevant in the specific neighbourhood or area. Interethnic contact for example is considered particularly relevant under changing demographic circumstances, when areas that were previously populated primarily by native Dutch experience a rapid increase of inhabitants with a migrant background such as in *IJselmonde, Rotterdam*[72]. On the other hand in more diverse areas, diversity is considered the *mainstream* and street-level bureaucrats here say to take this as a self-evident, though indirect, aspect of the neighbourhood such as in *Amsterdam Zuid-Oost* or *Rotterdam Zuid*[73]. These demographic circumstances are taken into account and responded to at the neighbourhood level.

As sketched above housing and neighbourhood policies have been decentralised, with a growing emphasis on the implementation but also steering from the neighbourhood level. In this area-based approach policy officers inform themselves both on qualitative (from the neighbourhood) and quantitative information (statistical information at the neighbourhood, city and national level). While quantitative information is increasingly available on the neighbourhood level[1], *ethnicity or diversity are not directly considered relevant criteria in these reports, demographic conditions are considered were relevant but the reach or impact of policies is not automatically measured in terms of ethnicity. "Also in research the focus is less on ethnicity, more orientated at generic policies such as poverty and housing, but not on ethnicity. … You check what the relevant demographic conditions are, try to contextualize it. But we only mention it when considered relevant*"[74]. Ethnicity should thus be understood as a derivative of the demographic conditions in the neighbourhood, rather than as a fixed focal point. "*Diversity is not a central aspect of our policies, nor do I expect it to be anytime soon*"[75].

The information structures rely primarily on the contacts of the social workers, embedded in the area-based neighbourhood approach. While formerly (migrant) consultation structures were additionally set up to inform policy makers from these different perspectives, and signal tensions or other developments within their community these structures have been withdrawn over the years since these structures are no longer believed to be desirable, representative and due to budget cuts. The migrant-organizations are still active, though they now work primarily project-based and are consulted only at an ad-hoc basis. Organization. The signalling in the neighbourhoods thus increasingly comes to depend on the dynamic network of the frontline workers. The workers and neighbourhood policy-coordinators we spoke to emphasize the need to develop these networks broadly and close to the

---

[72] Coordinator area-based working, Prins Alexander Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 18th of February 2015; Area coordinator social work Rotterdam, IJselmonde, interviewed 7th of April.

[73] Head of Frontline Project Office, interviewed 22nd of December 2014; Coordinator home-visits Support organisation, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

[74] Researcher, Research and Business Intelligence Rotterdam, interviewed 13th of February 2015.

[75] Coordinator area-based working, Department of Living and Housing Amsterdam, interviewed 9th of April 2015.

ground, "*it is about collectively defining the assignment*"[76]. As noticed in the context of anti-discrimination too, one of the challenges here is "*that as a 'second line' organisation you are expected to work with first line organisation, while they are gone, to large extent*"[77]. Less institutionalised, the new networks are more individualized and incidental. Likewise however these networks become more strongly dependent on the contacts of the frontline worker in question and his or her ability to forward these signals to the respective departments[78]. Because also within the departments the structures to report this upwards prove to be individually and incidentally driven, making these structures vulnerable.

When looking at the different programs in the neighbourhood, a differentiation can be made between regular social work and additional programs that actively approach vulnerable groups around poverty issues. '*Kansrijk Zuidoost*' (Amsterdam) and '*Bureau Frontlijn*' (Rotterdam) are examples of such active, door-to-door approaches operating in the most vulnerable neighbourhoods. '*Kansrijk Zuidoost*' is a program aimed at poverty reduction in the Amsterdam Southeast area. Initiated as a means to seize rental arrears of the residents, the program grew to a broad generic project approaching all residents in the area to indicate any social problems, or particularly gaps in their access to the government and regular welfare work. Likewise '*Bureau Frontlijn*' operates by an integral approach aimed at reducing poverty in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, with a clear bottom-up and integral approach. The target groups of '*Kansrijk Zuidoost*' and '*Bureau Frontlijn*' are anyone unable to participate independently, they reach these people by an active door-to-door approach or by for example referral by the midwife in the case of pregnant women. Due to their active involvement these programs have a wide (structural) reach through their problem based approach. "*People seem unable to find the way to regular institutes for help, for example because they do not speak the language. That is one of the main bottlenecks we encounter. … This signalling is an important part of our work.*"[79] In first instance the organizations approach all (selected) inhabitants after which their problems are inventoried on an individual level. While working in super diverse areas, ethnicity simply forms one of the many characteristics of the population and not an explicit policy priority. Where regular social work programs sometimes struggle in connecting actors and partners horizontally in their collaboration between actors and vertically between levels, in signalling and reporting upwards and downwards, the 'door to door' programs are especially assigned to bring this together from the bottom up. This integral and individual structure provides the space for a mainstreamed approach, operating problem-based.

Due to the growing emphasis on participation and self-organization of citizens', front line organizations signal the risk of leaving out vulnerable citizens that are unable to participate. While integral approaches have been set up for so called multi-problem-families, families or individuals at *risk* of drifting off are ineffectively reached. In the interaction with their clients both organizations recognize that citizens with no or a low income, low levels of participation (work or involvement in the neighbourhood) or weak networks are particularly vulnerable. Language issues can be a particular

---

[76] Social worker Amsterdam Oost, interviewed28th of January 2015.
[77] Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.
[78] Coordinator area-based working, Prins Alexander Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 18th of February 2015; Program manager Anti-discrimination, Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 11th of March 2015.
[79] Coordinator home-visits Support Organisation, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

obstacle here. To '*Kansrijk Zuidoost'* the diversity in terms of background and language form an explicit priority of their identity, as "*a specific response is sometimes simply necessary in a diverse setting such as in [Amsterdam]* Zuidoost"[80]. If necessary for example, the introductory meeting is done in the native language of the client to overcome language barriers (while simultaneously stressing the importance of learning the Dutch language). As part of their 'flanking policies' these signals are translated into additional specific (problem-based) projects focused on skill-deficiencies such as special cycling, budgeting- and swimming classes. Leading here however is the pro-active approach of these programs. "*There is a large supply [of social aid] in Amsterdam Southeast, but it does not connect to the problems. … Not everyone is in the picture. .. We are in the frontline. We collect it.*"[81] This active and integral signalling and mode of operation proves to be of vital importance to do justice to the complex set of needs in vulnerable neighbourhoods. Where inter alia language deficiencies are considered one of the obstacles to regular welfare structures. Now old social work and consultation structures diminish (such as the consulting of migrant organisations), new ways have to be found to map complex social problems. This is done on a problem-based basis, of which ethnicity may be one of the issues, rather than automatically taking certain factors and (vulnerable) groups into account.

3.2   Anti-Discrimination

Discrimination is prohibited by law[82] and can be followed up through different mechanisms (penal and civil). While originally the different grounds for discrimination, such as racism, were followed up separately these are now all generically recorded under the same header, entailing discrimination on the basis of skin colour or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion or belief, age and disability.

The main actors in the field of anti-discrimination monitoring are the local anti-discrimination agencies who report and follow-up complaints on discrimination. These complaints can be followed up by The Netherlands Institute for Human Rights to file a ruling on equal treatment, or by the police and the Public Prosecutor through the Penal Code.[83]

In Amsterdam and Rotterdam anti-discrimination is incorporated as a key element of the citizenship program[84]. While implemented primarily by the anti-discrimination agencies, the national and local government play a coordinating role in this. The local anti-discrimination agencies initially developed from the bottom up in the NGO-sector, but as of 2010 have been institutionalised through the Act on Local Anti-Dicrimination Facilities (*Wet gemeentelijke antidiscriminatievoorzieningen*). The Act requires all municipalities to facilitate anti-discrimination agencies to register discrimination-complaints. The anti-discrimination agencies annually report the registered complaints to national government[85]. As part of the Act, a periodical meeting between the anti-discrimination agencies, the

---

[80] Coordinator home-visits Support Organisation, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

[81] Coordinator home-visits Support Organisation, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

[82] Art. 1 of the Constitution; the General Law on Equal Treatment and Penal Code Art.429quater, Art. 137c-g

[83] Additionally certain forms of discrimination are reported seperatly as well, for example the CIDI (*Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israël*) registers incidents of anti-semimitism and SPIOR (*Stichting Platform Islamitische Organisaties Rotterdam*) registers incidents of Islamophobia (in cooperation with the Rotterdam anti-discrimination agency, see 4.2.1). Additionally the MDI (*Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet*) registers incidents discrimination taking place online.

[84] Under the new Rotterdam Integration Memorandum (*Integratie010*), following up the previous citizenship policies anti-discrimination is still considered a focal point.

[85] These reports are bundled together in an annual national report as published by the CBS. CBS (2012). *Registratie discriminatieklachten 2011*. Den Haag: CBS; CBS (2013). *Registratie discriminatieklachten 2012.* Den

police and the Public Prosecutor has been established, to discuss trends of discrimination and their follow up integrally. These figures are jointly published too. Besides monitoring complaints of discrimination, the anti-discrimination agencies are also involved in training and awareness campaigns. Additionally the local government in Rotterdam and Amsterdam was previously involved with the preventive side of anti-discrimination with occasional campaigns or training. The coordinators of anti-discrimination policies are housed at the department of Social Development.

As the willingness to report incidents of discrimination is known to be low, the local government also collects statistical information on *perceived* discrimination. The gap between reported and perceived numbers of discrimination forms an important theme in anti-discrimination campaigns and priorities. Additionally the Netherlands Institute of Social Research (SCP) conducts thematic research on discrimination trends in for example the labour market.

Anti-discrimination policies are coordinated and legally embedded at the national level, with a strong local focus in the implementation. At the national level anti-discrimination has been a priority since 2005 when the grounds for discrimination were broadened. Anti-discrimination facilities are now open to anyone who ever experienced discrimination, whether on the ground of ethnicity, religion, disability, gender or sexuality. In the sense of targeting anti-discrimination policies can be considered mainstreamed. Below we will look at how this affects the different grounds for discrimination. With regard to the policy orientation, anti-discrimination policies can be considered a means to bring diversity awareness to other generic policy fields, serving as a 'check' on the inclusiveness of these fields. Within the anti-discrimination field itself the main question is whether the anti-discrimination facilities effectively reach the entire diversity of the population it is supposed to serve. In terms of policy coordination, the third dimension of mainstreaming, the question is in how far the anti-discrimination facilities and anti-discrimination awareness are embedded in other policy areas and how these are coordinated between different actors.

3.2.1 Target grouping

Besides monitoring the anti-discrimination agencies are occupied with training and thematic projects, such as discrimination in sports, door policies at nightclubs and safety of LGTB's in the neighbourhood, and thematic research on polarisation or islamophobia. In addition to the formal reporting structures for anti-discrimination complaints, the anti-discrimination officers stress the importance of good networks in the neighbourhood in terms of signalling and targeting trends of discrimination[86]. However, these activities have been subject to retrenchment. Particularly in Rotterdam the financial support by the local government has been reduced to the monitoring and knowledge function only. Any 'first line' training and projects must thus be financed from other sources. But front line work is of utmost importance both in terms of *input,* for anti-discrimination policies as in terms of *output,*

Haag: CBS; CBS (2014). *Registratie discriminatieklachten 2013*. Den Haag: CBS. See also Coenders, M.T.A., Kik, J., Schaap, E., Silversmith, R. & Schriemer, R. (2012). *Kerncijfers 2011. Overzicht van discriminatieklachten en -meldingen geregistreerd bij antidiscriminatievoorzieningen*. Leeuwarden/Nijmegen: LBA/SAN.

[86] Director Amsterdam Anti-discrimination Agency Amsterdam, interviewed 15th of December 2014; Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015; Contact-officer discrimination Police Rotterdam, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

when implementing these policies. "*that is a very important way to 'feed' ourselves, to know what is going on in terms of tensions etcetera.*"[87].

In addition to the regular information streams Radar, the Rotterdam Anti-Discrimination Agency has recently started collecting information at the neighbourhood level too, through an area-based program. Based on neighbourhood profiles[88] they have made a selection of neighbourhoods in which they have structural consultation with key figures, individuals and for example collective neighbourhood lunches to get an idea of the issues at stake in the neighbourhood.

> "*This came directly from a need to collect more input on what is going on. … It is about connecting all our activities, to truly operate as a knowledge centre. From signalling, to analysing and transferring this to others. The contacts within the neighbourhood are essential in this.* "[89]

This becomes particularly clear around new groups, vulnerable for discrimination, such as the growing group of EU mobile citizens. As a researcher from the Rotterdam local anti-discrimination facility puts it: "*We know that group is there, but we receive very few complaints of discrimination from them. That is to us, a reason to be extra cautious.*" Adding that "*The signals we receive, we receive through our networks.*"[90]. The police too, emphasizes the need to actively collect this at the street-level. "*It is about having you contacts in the neighbourhood. A true area-based approach, and collect the signals there. At the neighbourhood level it is about safety and liveability, and then you seek contact with a certain target group. But target groups* an sich *are not a priority*" [91]. Also in their reporting structure the contact-officer discrimination of the police stresses the importance to be alert. All declarations and statements filed at the police station are scanned for discrimination, through a list of key words. "*This list is based on experience, and sometimes requires adjustment. For example with the migrants from Middle and Eastern Europe. That is a new group that faces discrimination too. So then we need new keywords to filter these complaints too.*"[92]

Besides the statistical information provided by the anti-discrimination agencies the coordinating policy makers hereby base themselves on the departments own network of social workers (organised area-based as described in 4.1.1), input from other subsidized projects, the knowledge centres (for Rotterdam)[93] and migrant-organizations. However, occupied with their primary tasks these generic welfare organizations seem insufficiently aware of discriminatory patterns, thus remaining invisible. As an anti-discrimination policy worker describes below, this forms a risk of diluting anti-discrimination priorities.

---

[87] Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.

[88] An integral (socal, fysical, safety) monitor on the neighbourhood level: 'Wijkprofielen' for Rotterdam http://wijkprofiel.rotterdam.nl/nl/home and 'gebiedscyclus' for Amsterdam http://www.amsterdam.nl/gemeente/organisaties/organisaties/sites/gebiedsgericht-0/artikelen/gebiedscyclus/

[89] Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.

[90] Researcher Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.

[91] Contact-officer discrimination Police Rotterdam, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

[92] Contact-officer discrimination Pration Police Rotterdam, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

[93] Knowledge-centre structure, with four centres focussing on respectively gender emancipation, homosexual emancipation, diversity and anti-discrimination.

> *"They only see the conflict and resolve it, but do not recognize the underlying discriminatory patterns. … When speaking to the neighbourhood workers they say it plays no role, but looking at the numbers that just does not make any sense. They did not have it on their radar. … But if we do not know what is at stake we cannot formulate policies on it"[94]*

The structures for social- and neighboorhoodwork have recently been revised (see chapter 3.1), under this structure the new neighbourhoodteams will be trained on discrimination awareness, due to interference from the coordinator for anti-discrimination. "*It is not on top of the list, but at least we are on it. But the list is long.. So many things to take into account. That is the complexity of social work in the city*"[95].

3.2.2 Effects

In terms of mainstreaming there are some challenges to the developments as taking place in the field of anti-discrimination policies. Firstly, it should be remarked that the willingness to report issues of discrimination. In general this is found to be low and can vary significantly in response to for example campaigns or media attention for discrimination related incidents (Radar 2013a). The levels of reported discrimination incidents balance between 6-9% for respectively Amsterdam and Rotterdam. People seem reluctant to report discrimination either because they feel this will not change the situation or feel like the incident was not severe enough to be reported (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2013b; Gemeente Rotterdam, 2014). Taking the low levels of reported incidents of discrimination into account it is important to look at other, generic monitors to get a full understanding of the issue.

The perceived levels of discrimination in Amsterdam and Rotterdam are roughly the same, varying between 19% for Rotterdam and 17% for Amsterdam in 2013[96]. In both cities, citizens with a migrant background seem particularly vulnerable for discrimination[97]. This corresponds with the most important grounds for discrimination, namely 'race'[98] Despite the big differences between perceived and reported complaints of discrimination, discrimination on the basis of race turns out the most dominant in all the figures. Whereas reporting and monitoring mechanisms have improved over time, some of these topics tend to be difficult to follow up or to implement. As one of the coordinators stated: "*The figures are available.. We know what's going on, at least that what is measurable. It is a matter of following this up now*"[99]. In their joint publication Radar and the Rotterdam Police Force advise to dedicate specific attention to racism and organizations with a high reach amongst the groups

---

[94] Program manager Anti-discrimination, Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 11th of March 2015.

[95] Program manager Anti-discrimination, Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 11th of March 2015.

96 Dropped to 14% in Rotterdam for 2014, numbers for Amsterdam over 2014 not yet available.
See Gemeente Amsterdam, 2013b and Gemeente Rotterdam, 2013b

97 Perceiving respectively levels of 22% and 25% in Rotterdam and Amsterdam in 2013 and 2011 (against 10% and 16% for native Dutch);
Radar speaks of 'allochton background' for the Rotterdam case (Radar, 2013b), while in the Amsterdam report this is split out in Western- and non-Western allochtons (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2013b)

[98] Rotterdam: 36% of perceived incidents of discrimination, followed by 29% for nationality (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2014, p.9). Amsterdam: 46% of perceived discrimination on basis of race. In Amsterdam religion, particularly the discrimination of Jews and Muslims, is considered an important ground too. (Gemeente Amsterdam 2012, p.11).

[99] Program manager Anti-discrimination, Diversity and Citizenship Department, interviewed 6th of March 2015.

most often discriminated. They indicate that while anti-Semitism and homophobia almost self-evidently receive policy, media and political attention, such attention is not proportionally given to racial discrimination (Mink and Schilt 2014: p.23).

Secondly, in terms of a diversity- and anti-discrimination awareness, it proves hard to effectively address and implement (anti)-discrimination policies for the whole mainstreamed population. This has to do with the politicization of diversity, the coordination between departments and actors and the reach of policy implementation policies. While anti-discrimination are mentioned as an explicit element of the citizenship policy frame in both Amsterdam and Rotterdam, and the monitoring systems formally seem well established, the policy officers we spoke to experienced difficulties in reporting signals of discrimination upwards. Particularly racism, as a specific form of discrimination proves difficult to prioritise. While previously a separate policy field, anti-racism was reframed generically in terms of anti-discrimination policies, but now it seems particularly difficult to get proportionally address racism. While specific projects and networks have been developed to specifically address for example LGTB-discrimination policy makers seem reluctant to do so when it comes to racism. Instead anti-discrimination policies are framed in economic terms, as an obstruction to (individualized) participation. Without an explicit anti-discrimination policy[100] and limited active involvement on diversity and ethnicity, and ethnicity in particular, the policies seem unable to tackle this important ground for discrimination. Two researchers from the anti-discrimination agency in Rotterdam express their sorrows towards the receptiveness of politicians and policy makers to these signals:

> "*That is a challenge to us, to see how we can steer this. Racism for example, we could not do anything on that for years. Because politically it was not considered an issue, it was considered passé. Since last year this has changed [referring to increased public debate on racism]. Than we can pick up on it, and put it back on the agenda. … We of course always keep working on it, but only when the public tide turns, you are really able to address the issue. … This is easier for other groups or themes, such as for example discrimination of LGTB's [Lesbian-Gay-Transgender-Bisexuals].*"

> [colleague]: "*We have a function to inform the municipality, and indeed receive several questions from policymakers, the contact are good, but the image of the Alderman or Minister that subsidizes an organization for critical reflection, that no longer applies everywhere. That is something we have to take into account*"[101]

This becomes particularly clear around 'Islamophobia'. Although several studies indicate a trend in growing feelings and incidents of Islamophobia (see e.g. Van der Valk, 2012; ECRI, 2013), anti-discrimination agencies face difficulties when trying to create proportional policy attention for this phenomenon[102]. On top of the regular reporting structures, a special (externally funded) project to

---

[100] Rotterdam published their last anti-discrimination memorandum in 2007 (Gemeente Rotterdam 2007b), Amsterdam published their last annual Autumn policy letter on anti-discrimination in 2013 (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2013d).

[101] Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.

[102] Director Amsterdam Anti-discrimination Agency Amsterdam, interviewed 15th of December 2014; Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015; Director and policy advisor Foundation Platform Islamic Organisations Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of March 2015.

report complaints of Islamophobia was launched in cooperation between e.g. Radar, the Rotterdam anti-discrimination agency and Spior, a Rotterdam platform for Islamic organizations. A similar initiative is developed in Amsterdam by EMCEMO, an Amsterdam organization for Euro-Mediterranean Migration and Development[103]. Both initiatives are developed because the levels of reporting on this topic are known to be particularly low and the regular -mainstream- anti-discrimination agencies prove incapable to address the victims of Islamophobia. As one of our informants explains:

> "*The municipality considers it a responsibility of Radar [Rotterdam Anti-discrimination Agency] to deal with Islamophobia. Radar says; yes of course it is our legal responsibility to register complaints of discrimination, but in this specific case we see particular low levels of reporting amongst a specific group. That is where we [Rotterdam Islamic Platform Spior] come in, because of the specific and intermediary role we play.. It is about the effectiveness too, to reach the right people effectively. There the issue of trust comes in again.*"[104]

Regular anti-discrimination organisations prove to be incapable to address such specific issues and challenges of e.g. underreporting in their mainstream activities, both in terms of finances and capacities. But separate and additional funding seems difficult to realise, as there is a strong reluctance to specific or targeted projects or organisations. Thus while the information on discrimination is widely available it proves difficult to effectively address specific problems where they come up, as the strictly mainstreamed anti-discrimination policies (and climate) leave little room for this 'switch'. As one the researchers from Radar puts it: "*You have to be able to switch. … That is the crux. But this switch is difficult, this next step is not taken because there are generic policies. We freeze when specific attention is needed on a particular ground for discrimination*"[105]. This challenges the effectively addressing and implementation of (anti)-discrimination policies for the whole mainstreamed population.

Thirdly, of vital importance to effective anti-discrimination policies is the coordination between departments and (non)-state-actors to improve discrimination awareness and prevent it from happening. As formulated under the polycentric aspect of mainstreaming. When anti-discrimination issues touch upon different departments, such as education or the labour market it proves difficult to prioritise anti-discrimination issues. There are no structural meetings between the departments. The coordinators try to bring anti-discrimination and a diversity-awareness to the focus whenever the opportunity occurs, such as a collaboration with the department of education for the development of citizenship education programs. However, this coordination remains indirect " *It is indirect, we coordinate it from here, but whether it is followed up depends on how receptive your respective partner is to the proposal. … You have to seduce them to do something on diversity*"[106]. Backed up by combined portfolios such as the current portfolio of education and diversity of the Alderman in Amsterdam, can be helpful in establishing these relations. But as the above examples illustrate, this is not automatically on their radar. A promising example in this are the 'lifestyle and cultures' networks within the police

---

[103] http://www.spior.nl/meld-islamofobie-2/; http://emcemo.nl/index.php/2012-02-02-06-34-41
[104] Director and policy advisor Foundation Platform Islamic Organisations Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of March 2015.
[105] Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.
[106] Program manager Anti-discrimination, Diversity and Citizenship Department Amsterdam, interviewed 6th of March 2015.

force. A selection of police men of all levels and departments follow an additional training on lifestyle and diversity awareness and bring this to their respective departments and incorporate this in their daily practices[107]. On the whole, anti-discrimination policies seem incidentally and ad-hoc driven. As one of the researchers of the Rotterdam Anti-discrimination agency puts it: *"it is complicated to integrate this, anti-discrimination simply is not the mainstream"*[108] A vulnerability in this is the lack of a policy narrative, to back up a structure for these issues. While anti-discrimination is still an official policy priority under the Rotterdam generic citizenship policies (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2010) and the current Integration Memorandum (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2015) and part of the Amsterdam citizenship policies (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2011), no explicit policy strategies or letters have recently been published on the matter in both cities[109]. While the structures to report discrimination complaints have been institutionalized from the national level, a broader vision on the prevention of anti-discrimination seems to disappear. This complicates the attempts to address issues of anti-discrimination issues as part of a broader approach than just an individual case-by-case basis. To be able to establish long-term results, *"you need to create a sense of urgency. … The results of this work are only visible on the long term. But [policymakers] tend to stop there"*[110] focusing on visible results on the short term.

3.3 Conclusions

In the context of the analysis of this chapter, we found clear differences between housing and neighbourhood policies on the one hand and anti-discrimination on the other. Housing and neighbourhood policies are typical examples of a so-called area-based proxy policy for migrant integration. Our analysis shows that this area-based proxy has been implemented effectively in the Netherlands, both in Rotterdam and the Netherlands. This is only partially a recent development; area-focused policies developed already since the 1990s, but have since then been intensified at several occasions, also focusing on those areas where many people with a migration background live. Diversity can sometimes still play an important role on the level of policy discourse (such as for the National Program South), but in terms of implementation, housing and neighbourhood policies are mostly colour-blind.

Similar to what we found in the field of education, we also found for housing and neighbourhood policies that mainstreaming was closely associated to decentralization and deconcentration (poly-centric governance). Local governments, borough organizations, and in some cases also NGO's play an important role in the street-level implementation of area-based proxies. The frontline workers have the knowledge about who lives in a neighbourhood, what the main concerns are in a local setting and how to reach people. These frontline workers are, thus, also key in taking account of the role that diversity can play in specific local circumstances. This can also lead to finetuning by means of specific and targeted measures wherever front line workers see this is as necessary, such as language assistance for migrants to make sure that they have access to frontline services.

---

[107] Contact-officer discrimination Police Rotterdam, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

[108] Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.

[109] Rotterdam published their last anti-discrimination memorandum in 2007 (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2007b), Amsterdam published their last annual Autumn policy letter on anti-discrimination in 2013 (Gemeente Amsterdam, 2013d).

[110] Contact-officer discrimination Police Amsterdam, interviewed 3rd of March 2015.

On the level of frontline workers, mainstreaming is seen as largely effective by key stakeholders. One factor that is mentioned in this context, is that mainstreaming allows frontline workers to cope with the often complex accumulation and overlap of different forms of deprivation amongst individuals or families. The group is not a target per se here, and diversity and cultural orientations may come in here as one factor amongst many for some individuals/families. Mainstreaming thus allows for a more integrated approach.

However, just like in the area of education, for housing and neighbourhood policies there seems to be a decreasing availability of information regarding migrant groups. As a consequence, the 'signalling function' of information and expertise that has been mentioned several times for the Dutch case, seems to be under pressure.

The practice of anti-discrimination policies seems to be somewhat different. First of all, anti-discrimination is of course a generic measure aimed at the 'whole society', however it also clearly mentions colour and ethnicity as grounds for which discrimination is prohibited. As part of citizenship programs in both Rotterdam and Amsterdam, we have seen that this is one of the few examples of an explicit orientation on diversity as part of mainstreaming in general and anti-discrimination in particular.

However, the practice of mainstreaming in this area seems very different than for housing and neighbourhood policies. Whereas in the latter front line officials play a key role in the implementation of a strategy that is colour-blind but in practice flexibly manages to take diversity in account wherever necessary, for anti-discrimination we find a more targeted policy area where the implementation in practice seems much less adept to addressing diversity areas. Stakeholders from both cities report this as a lack of prioritization of discrimination on colour or ethnic grounds (for instance when compared to LGTB discrimination). In this way the strict and dominant frame of mainstreaming overrules specific interference where necessary, at the cost of vulnerable groups.

Chapter 4   Conclusions

This report provides an analysis of the practice of mainstreaming. How does mainstreaming work at the street-level, and what do actors see as the main effects of mainstreaming? This analysis is based on interviews and focus groups with stakeholders, more specifically street-level and 'frontline' policymakers and NGO's working at the local level, and by document analysis. The analysis focuses on in four policy topics within the areas of education and social cohesion: early childhood education and care, language interventions, anti-discrimination and housing and neighbourhood policies. As the practice of mainstreaming takes place primarily at the (sub-) local level, we focus on specific areas within the cities of Rotterdam (Delfshaven and Rotterdam South) and Amsterdam (Oost and Zuid-Oost).

Our analysis shows that mainstreaming has clearly trickled down into the 'frontline' practice of migrant integration in the Netherlands. In education, needs-based proxies have been effectively implemented, by and large replacing any notion of colour or ethnicity. Such proxies include measurements of language deprivation, sometimes of the partners of children, and measuring the educational level of parents. In social cohesion, especially for housing and neighbourhood policies, the area-based proxy has already been in place for a much longer period. This includes a focus on areas where many migrants live, such as Rotterdam South, but without an explicit focus on these migrants per se. In some cases, needs- and area-based proxies even overlap, for instance in the distribution of funding for educational purposes to specific neighbourhoods in Rotterdam.

Furthermore, the stakeholders that have been involved in this analysis are generally rather satisfied with how the mainstreamed measures still manage to address concerns experienced by migrant groups. Without framing groups explicitly, the educational programs still largely target migrant populations, and the area-based proxies also targeted many areas where migrants are strongly represented. Only few 'vulnerable' categories were identified by stakeholders that would be at risk of being left out by a mainstreamed approach; and in most cases, such vulnerable categories were met by additional local efforts.

Our analysis shows in particular that the relation between mainstreaming and decentralization/ deconcentration proves to be very effective. In absence of a more centralized and target group specific approach, the more localized and mainstreamed approach provides much more discretion to front-line or street-level workers to adequately respond to the specific local setting. This allows for a more integrated approach that focuses on the often complex set (or accumulation) of problems with specific individuals or families, of which migration-related diversity may be one of the factors. In our analysis, various programs were found (such as National Program Rotterdam South and Kansrijk Zuidoost) that developed a pro-active approach in this respect, sometimes even in the form of approaching of individuals and families door-to-door. We also found that these street-level workers do take account of migration-related diversity much more explicitly than the 'paper reality' suggests, but only for those cases where it seems fit.

This 'front-line' pragmatism when it comes to generic or specific measures was found in all four neighbourhoods that we examined in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Both have more targeted street-level practices in spite of the mainstreamed paper reality in both cities. However, very interestingly

we found that the 'framing' of these targeted measures differs between both cities. In Rotterdam, the adoption of targeted measures in those cases where needed is framed in terms of pragmatic problem solving; adopting the right (temporary) measures wherever necessary. In Amsterdam, it is framed rather as a response to the super diverse situation of the city.

However, our analysis also identifies several risks in terms of mainstreaming. One of these risks concerns the decreasing presence of data and information on the position of relevant migrant groups. Whereas in terms of policymaking we have seen that data and statistics play a key role in setting migration-related concerns on the agenda, in terms of the practice of policies the availability of data and statistics that allow for checking whether mainstreaming actually address these migration-related concerns seems to be weakening. This may lead to what we have described as 'blind mainstreaming', or the absence of sufficient understanding whether mainstreamed integration policies still manage to resolve integration problems.

Another risk, which is actually related to the previous one, concerns the fading prioritization of migrant integration. This applies in particular to anti-discrimination where all appropriate, also targeted, measures are in place but not fully implemented in practice. Stakeholders indicate that this is due to the low prioritization of colour and ethnicity, especially when compared to several other grounds of discrimination.

Finally, our analysis of the practice of mainstreaming in the Dutch case shows that mainstreaming does not effectively involve a 'whole society' approach. This applies in particular in terms of the absence of a whole society approach to raise awareness for migration-related diversity. The mainstreaming of integration governance does not really affect the mainstream of society. Through the area- and needs-based proxies it still largely targets migrants, relatively small groups of 'natives' that live in neighbourhoods with migrants or that share the same needs. In the absence of programs aimed at raising awareness of diversity in society at large, the current mainstreaming of integration continues to involve a coupling between 'problems' and 'migrants.' Although anti-discrimination is part of citizenship programs, as we have seen, the priority put on race or Islamophobia in this respect seems low.

Appendix A - interviews

_____

Amsterdam

- IBC Teacher primary education, interviewed 8th of December 2014.

- IBC Coordinator secondary education, interviewed 9th of December 2014.

- Director Amsterdam Anti-discrimination Agency Amsterdam, interviewed 15th of December 2014.

- ECEC coordinator, ECEC teacher and ECEC teacher, interviewed 7th of January 2015.

- Social worker Amsterdam Oost, interviewed on the 28th of January 2015.

- Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 10th of February 2015.

- Language coordinator and teacher primary education, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

- Coordinator summer schools and CEO of a project agency planning many of the language interventions in the borough, interviewed 18th of February 2015.

- Head of one of the departments within a secondary school, interviewed 19th of February 2015.

- Contact-officer discrimination Police Amsterdam, interviewed 3rd of March 2015.

- Program manager Anti-discrimination, Diversity and Citizenship Department, interviewed 6th of March 2015.

- CEO of a primary school, interviewed 6th of March 2015.

- Senior Policy advisor Primary education, parental involvement and language of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 13th of March 2015.

- Policy advisor language interventions and parental involvement in primary education of the municipality of Amsterdam, interviewed 17th of March 2015.

- Coordinator and voluntary consultants Support Organization - Living, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 18th of March 2015.

- Chairman Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Migration and Development, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

- Coordinator home-visits Support Organization, Amsterdam Zuidoost, interviewed 25th of March 2015.

- Director Head-classes ('Kopklas'), interviewed 27th of March 2015.

- Coordinator area-based working, Department of Living and Housing Amsterdam, interviewed 9th of April 2015.

Rotterdam

- Coordinator toddler consultants, interviewed 16th of December 2014.

- Head of Frontline Project Office, interviewed 22nd of December 2014.

- CEO/ECEC facility and Team manager of the four ECEC locations, interviewed 13th of January 2015.

- Senior policy advisor education, interviewed 26th of January 2015.

- Researchers Anti-discrimination Agency Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of January 2015.

- Coordinator Living and Administration of the NPRS program, interviewed 30th of January 2015.

- Contact-officer discrimination Police Rotterdam, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

- Coordinator Umbrella Organization for Migrant self-organizations in Rotterdam, interviewed 12th of February 2015.

- Researcher, Research and Business Intelligence Rotterdam, interviewed 13th of February 2015.

- Coordinator area-based working, Prins Alexander, Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 18th of February 2015.

- Advisor school and monitoring of the NPRS program, interviewed 3rd of March 2015 .

- CEO of a secondary school for secondary vocational education (incl. IBC classes), interviewed 23rd of March 2015.

- Program manager Anti-discrimination, Department of Social Development Rotterdam, interviewed 11th of March 2015.

- Head of Space and Living, City development department of Rotterdam, interviewed 18th of March 2015.

- Director and policy advisor Foundation Platform Islamic Organizations Rotterdam, interviewed 27th of March 2015.

- Area coordinator social program, Rotterdam IJselmonde and area manager,Rotterdam IJselmonde, interviewed 7th of April.

Appendix B – Focus groups

_____

Amsterdam: 25-02-2015

Attendees:

- Director Amsterdam Anti-discrimination Agency.
- Program manager borough-approach, City of Amsterdam.
- Policy advisor of the company managing all playgrounds in Amsterdam Zuidoost.
- Policy advisor of a day-care company with many venues in Amsterdam.
- Policy advisor ECEC, City of Amsterdam (prior experience in broader education policies).
- Data analyst/scientific researcher, Education research cluster, City of Amsterdam
- Data analyst, Education research cluster, City of Amsterdam

Rotterdam: 24-02-2015

Attendees:

- Policy advisor of the City of Rotterdam, department social development.
- Policy advisor of the City of Rotterdam, department education.
- Head of the areas and living department, city development of Rotterdam.
- Coordinator IBC-classes in Rotterdam.
- NPRS advisor school and monitoring.
- Director anti-discrimination agencies.
- Advisor knowledge centre on diversity.

References

Boer, M. (2011). *Kansen in Kaart. Een verkennend onderzoek naar de ontwikkeling van tweedejaarsnieuwkomers in groep 3 t/m 8.* [Thesis]. Amsterdam: ABC Onderwijsadviseurs.

Directoraat-Generaal Wonen, Wijken en Integratie (2007). *Brief kader herziening huisvestigingswet.* The Hague: Ministerie van Volkshuisvestiging, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (VROM).

Driessen, G. (2012). *De doelgroepen van het onderwijsachterstandenbeleid: ontwikkelingen in prestaties en het advies voortgezet onderwijs*. Nijmegen: ITS: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Driessen, G. (2013). *De bestrijding van onderwijsachterstanden: Een review van opbrengsten en effectieve aanpakken.* Nijmegen: ITS.

ECRI (European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance) (2013). *ECRI-rapport over Nederland (vierde monitoringcyclus).* Strasbourg: ECRI.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2006). *Mensen maken Amsterdam. Programma akkoord Amsterdam 2006-2010.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2007). *Krachtige mensen, krachtige buurten, krachtige uitvoering. De Amsterdamse Wijkenaanpak.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2010). *Kwaliteitskader Voor- en Vroegschoolse Educatie (VVE) Amsterdam 2010-2014*. Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2011). *Geen burgerschap zonder hoffelijkheid.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2013). *Tussenrapportage uitvoeringsagenda Actieve Ouders 2012-2014; Ouderbetrokkenheid in het onderwijs*. Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam, Department of social development.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2013b). *Discriminatiebeeld*. Amsterdam: DOS - Onderzoek en Statistiek.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2013c). *Amsterdamse Burgermonitor 2013*. Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2013d). *Najaarsbrief anti-discriminatie 2013. 15 oktober 2013.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2014). *Jaarrapportage 2013 Voor- en Vroegschoolse educatie.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam, Department of social development, team ECEC and day-care.

Gemeente Amsterdam (2015). *Verordening op het lokaal onderwijsbeleid in de gemeente Amsterdam 2014.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam. (Gemeenteblad 2015, afd. 3a, nr. 23/49)

Gemeente Rotterdam (2006). *De stad van aanpakken; Voor een Rotterdams resultaat. Collegeprogramma 2006-20*10. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2007). *Uitwerkingsnotitie schakelklassen Rotterdam*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam, Department of Youth, Education and Society.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2007b) "Discriminatie? De groeten!" Uitvoeringsprogramma integrale aanpak discriminatie en uitsluiting. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam, Dienst Jeugd, Onderwijs en Samenleving.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2008). *Dialogen Stadsburgerschap. Bruggen bouwen. 'Het motto is meedoen'. Uitvoeringsprogramma 2008-2010.* Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam, Dienst Jeugd, Onderwijs en Samenleving.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2010). *Coalitieakkoord 2010-2014. Ruimte voor Talent en Ondernemen.* Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2013). *Staat van Rotterdam 2013*. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam, Department Onderzoek en Business Intelligence.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2014). *Feitenkaart Rotterdammers over hun stad: Omnibusenquête 2014.* Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Gemeente Rotterdam (2015). *Integratie 010.* Conceptnota. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Gijsberts, M. & Dagevos, J. (2005). *Uit elkaars buurt. De invloed van etnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming.* The Hague: Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.

Gijsberts, M. & Dagevos, J. (2007). *Interventies voor integratie. Het tegengaan van etnische concentratie en bevorderen van interetnisch contact*. The Hague: Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.

Hacquebord, H. (2012). *Begrijpend lezen van basisschool naar voortgezet onderwijs*. Retrieved, 27-03-2015, via: http://media.taalunieversum.org/hsnbundel/download/26/hsnbundel-26_1096.pdf

Maan, X., Van Breugel, I. and Scholten, P. (2014). *The Politics of Mainstreaming, Immigrant Integration Policies: Case study of the Netherlands.* Click here.

Mink, I. and Schilt, H. (2014). *Discriminatie in beeld 2013. Een analyse van de discriminatieregistraties in 2013 van Politie, RADAR en Openbaar Ministerie in de politie eenheid Rotterdam.* Rotterdam: Politie, eenheid Rotterdam en Radar.

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (2013): *Brief over leefbaarheid*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken.

Minister van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (2010). Besluit specifieke uitkeringen gemeentelijk onderwijsachterstandenbeleid 2011–2014. *Staatsblad*. 2010, nr. 687.

Minister van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Wethouder Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin Rotterdam (2012). *Bestuursafspraken G4/G33 – Rijk: Effectief benutten van vve en extra leertijd voor*

jonge kinderen. Retrieved, 30-09-2014, via:
http://www.rotterdam.nl/JOS/Bestuursafspraken_G4-G33-Rijk_vve_en_extra_leertijd.pdf

Minister voor Immigratie, Integratie en Asiel (2012). *Primair onderwijs: Brief van de Minister voor Immigratie, Integratie en Asiel.* Assembly year 2011–2012, 31 293, nr. 142.

Mulder, L., Paas, T. Van der Veen, I & Elshof, D. (2011). *Onderwijsprestaties en schoolloopbanen na de schakelklas; Een vervolgonderzoek bij leerlingen die in 2006/07 of 2007/08 in een schakelklas hebben gezeten.* Nijmegen: ITS.

Mulder, L., Van der Hoeven, A., Vierke, H., Ledoux, G., Van der Veen, I., Oud, W., Van Daalen, M. & Roeleveld, J. (2008). *Inrichting en effecten van schakelklassen. Resultaten van het evaluatieonderzoek schakelklassen in het schooljaar 2006/2007.* Nijmegen: ITS.

Onderwijsraad (2013). *Vooruitgang boeken met achterstandsmiddelen*. The Hague: Onderwijsraad.

Radar (2013a). *Stemmingen en Koersen Discriminatie in 2013, een overzicht in vogelvlucht.* Rotterdam: Radar, see http://radar.nl/read/cijfers-2011

Radar (2013b). *Extra Analyse Omnibus enquete.* Rotterdam: Radar.

Roeleveld, J., Driessen, G., Ledoux, G., Cuppen. J., & Meijer, J. (2011). *Doelgroepleerlingen in het basisonderwijs. Historische ontwikkeling en actuele situatie*. Amsterdam: Kohnstamm Instituut

Scholten, P. (2011). *Framing Immigrant Integration: Dutch research-policy dialogues in comparative perspective*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Scheffer. P. & Entzinger, H. (2012). *De Staat van Integratie. Rotterdam Amsterdam.* Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam en Gemeente Amsterdam.

Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (2009). *Wijziging van de Wet kinderopvang, de Wet op het onderwijstoezicht, de Wet op het primair onderwijs en enkele andere wetten in verband met wijzigingen in het onderwijsachterstandenbeleid: Memorie van Toelichting*. Assembly year 2008–2009, 31 989, nr. 3.

Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (2010). *Ouderbetrokkenheid in VVE.* The Hague: Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap.

Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (2013). *Primair onderwijs: Brief van de staatssecretaris van onderwijs, cultuur en wetenschap*. Assembly year 2012–2013, 31 293, nr. 181.

Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal (1983). *Minderhedenbeleid 1983.* Assembly year 1982-1983, 16 102, nr. 20–21.

Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal (2004). *Onderzoek Integratiebeleid Eindrapport.* Assembly year 2003-2004, 28 689, nr. 8-9.

Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal (2006). *Jaarnota Integratiebeleid 2006.* Assembly year 2006-2007, 30 810, nr. 2.

Valk, I. van der (2012). *Islamophobia in the Netherlands* (With a foreword by Ernst Hirsch Ballin). Amsterdam: University Press.

Van Breugel, Maan and Scholten (2014). Conceptualizing Mainstreaming in Integration Governance; a literature review (workpackage 1). Click here.

Veen, A., Veen, van der I., Driessen, G., Felix, C. & Elshof, D.P. (2012). Het bereik van allochtone kinderen met Voor- en Vroegschoolse Educatie. Amsterdam: Kohnstamm Instituut.

Wethouder van Onderwijs, Jeugd en Gezin (2014). *Beleidsregel Onderwijs Rotterdam 2014-2015.* Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Wijnbergen, C. (2012). *Nieuwkomersonderwijs PO: Organisatie, financiering, kwaliteit en uitvoering.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam, Department of social development.